

not spontaneous but the work of demagogues who live by the trade. Against Irish sympathy with a party in Ireland, manifested in ways consistent with morality, British Canadians can have nothing to say. Most of them hold, apart from any feeling for British greatness, that the proposal to sever Ireland, with her mixed population of Catholic Celts and Protestant Saxons from her sister island, in which there is also a great mass of Catholic Irish, and to erect her into a separate, and as she assuredly could be, hostile Republic, is insane; that it emanates not from anything worthy of the name of statesmanship, but from incendiarism which is mainly selfish; and that if it prevailed the results would be civil war and a recurrence of the whole cycle of calamities. But if Irish Canadians think differently they are of course at liberty to maintain their own opinion. Active participation in the Fenian war against Great Britain will of course be opposed. So, let Mr. Blake and any other political swain who may be counting the Catholic vote, take notice, will any attempt again to use the influence of the Parliament of Canada in aid of a conspiracy for the dismemberment of the United Kingdom. Otherwise, we may differ on this as on other questions without breach of civil amity, and certainly without breach of religious tolerance, since the head of the Catholic Church has declared against Mr. Parnell.

Let the point of difference, too, be clearly understood. No party of Englishmen, in Canada or in Great Britain has a word to say against the extension of local self-government in Ireland. Parliament was preparing to deal, in a liberal sense, with the local institutions of all three kingdoms, as it had dealt in a more than liberal sense with the Land question in Ireland, when this rebellion broke out, and for the time rendered decentralization impossible, inasmuch as a police in local hands would be in the hands of terrorists and murderers. Whether the Irish peasant really cares much for institutions, either local or central, or for anything but the land, may be doubted; as it may be doubted whether County Councils would infuse into his breast the spirit of independence, and render him less the slave of the Priest and the local agitator in Ireland, than he is of the priest and the Boss in New York. Yet what is done for England and Scotland, supposing rebellion out of the way, must be done for Ireland also, and there would be a double gain in anything which, by consigning local affairs to local councils, would at once relieve the Imperial Parliament of a needless burden, and take the strain off the bond of Union. Nor has anybody a word to say against the cultivation of an Irish nationality like the Scotch nationality, which is perfectly compatible with the Union. But neither extension of local self-government nor a nationality within the Union is the aim of Mr. Parnell. His aim, and that of his associates, as they frankly own, is Separation, accompanied, if possible, by the destruction of the British power; for their hatred of Great Britain is, at least, as strong as their love of Ireland. Their confederates are the foreign enemies of the realm and of the British race, who are waging against us a war of assassination, and twice invaded Canada. That Canada should, under any pretence, be drawn morally into the conflict on the side hostile to the Mother Country, will not be tamely endured; and any intriguer who plays that game is likely to be practically reminded of the forgotten fact, that though Englishmen and Scotchmen are not given to sinister and unpatriotic combinations apart from the body of their fellow citizens, there are an English and a Scotch, as well as an Irish, vote.

A BYSTANDER.

### MISCELLANEOUS.

FOLLOWING close upon the heels of the *Lancet's* philippic upon the same question, the English *Queen* has now taken up the subject of intemperance amongst women. It is somewhat remarkable that public attention on both sides of the Atlantic should have been simultaneously drawn to the fact that this vice is largely upon the increase. It is not less worthy of note that the unfortunate effects are attributed with singular unanimity to the same causes, by writers on either side of the ocean. Not a few keen observers prophesied that Mr. Gladstone's measure cheapening light drinks would prove disastrous to the English nation, and four or five years ago pointed to the increase of female intemperance as one result, though it has taken until now for this to become a burning question in the press. The grocers' licenses are principally blamed. With apparent truth, the *Queen* and its trans-Atlantic contemporaries say: "A woman who would not be seen entering a public house, can obtain, without suspicion, bottles of spirits from the grocer, and indulge in secret drinking until such times as the results make themselves manifest." The pitiable condition of a husband and father who daily returns tired with toil to find his home worse than desolate, is graphically portrayed, and a pessimist view of the situation formulated. The ladies' organ referred to can see no

hope for female inebriates but in a compulsory Habitual Drunkards' Act, whilst the preventives advocated are abolition of grocers' licenses and the exclusion of women as license holders.

It is more than probable that our contemporary has overlooked a strong pre-disposing cause for alcoholic indulgence by women. The pernicious habit of giving children small quantities of alcohol is doubtless answerable for a great deal of adult drinking. But it is generally conceded that dipsomania is hereditary, and that the child of even what is known as a moderate drinker will probably inherit a taste for alcohol. This has been abundantly demonstrated in the case of young men; but, previous to permits to sell liquors being granted to grocers, young women had no "respectable" means of getting at the article craved for. And it is precisely amongst the class of women who could be influenced by considerations of "respectability" that the increase of intemperance has taken place. Amongst their poorer sisters the evil has only too long been common. And when it is remembered that the women of to-day are the mothers of the coming generation, the importance of the question becomes intensified.

AFTER receiving the intelligence, just to hand, that Mr. Gladstone's new Reform Bill will embrace the establishment of the franchise on a national and liberal basis identical in the three kingdoms, it is reassuring to know that a later cablegram announces the meeting of loyalists in Dublin not only passed off peaceably, but that in complete contrast to the company at the Parnell banquet, it included representatives of the best sections of Irish society. The *Times* describes it as "the most imposing political demonstration within the memory of men now living."

A LONDON correspondent, referring to Lord Randolph Churchill, the ultramontane leader of the "fourth party" in the British House of Commons, says: "He has what I suppose must be called a policy on Irish matters. I can imagine an Irishman summing it up in two words—bully and bribe."

STRIPPED of all technicalities and side-issues, the result of the *cause célèbre* *Belt v. Lawes*, which for so long a time occupied the attention of Baron Huddleston last year, was that Mr. Lawes was ordered to pay Mr. Belt £5,000 for saying that gentleman was not a sculptor. The costs of course followed the verdict, bringing the total up to £15,000, and the finding of the jury met with unqualified approval from the British public. The defendant, however, appealed to a court comprising Justices Coleridge, Manisty, and Denman, and the two latter reduced the fine to £500 and the sum total to £10,500. Probably nauseated at the interminable length to which the case was being drawn out, the plaintiff consented to accept the award, but to the amazement of everyone Mr. Lawes gave notice of further appeal, and so the end is not yet.

THE New York *Tribune* thus pithily summarises the illogical and absurd position of *soi-disant* promoters of international copyright schemes:—"It is true" they say, "that the American author is entitled to the ownership of his work abroad as well as at home, and that the parallel rights of the foreign author ought to be recognized here. It is true that it would be of great advantage to us all if these rights were protected by law. But we will not protect them entirely. We are willing to admit the principle by protecting them a little; we are not willing to treat products of the brain quite so well as we treat products of mechanical skill, or to place international copyright on the same level as home copyright." In the measure introduced by Congressman Dorsheimer it is proposed that copyright in a foreign work shall be limited to twenty-five years, without the privilege of renewal, and that it shall cease on the death of the grantee. Why should a distinction be made between a native and foreign author? Twenty-five years is too short a time to pay for the laborious composition of higher class literature, and the proviso that a copyright shall lapse on the author's death is still more mischievous, not alone to his heirs and successors, but to himself. What publisher will purchase a book the right to which is contingent upon its author's life?

A PARAGRAPH has been going the round of the dailies to the effect that both the English Tory leaders, the Marquis of Salisbury and Sir Stafford Northcote, were presidents of the celebrated Union Debating Club at Oxford. So also were Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Lowe, Mr. Goschen, the Earl of Dufferin, Lord Chancellor Selborne, Sydney Herbert, and Cardinal Manning. Gladstone and Coleridge were previously renowned at Eton, where, in company with many others, they debated in the "Pop,"—a room so named on account of its being situated over a ginger beer shop. Glad