

pulpit had scarcely ceased to fulminate anathemas against the great discovery of Jenner, and medical men whose science still felt the influence of clerical restraint openly denounced vaccination; now the appearance of the Roman Catholic clergy as the tardy ally of sanitary science is so novel that the new command which it delivers is far from being responded to by the universal obedience of the bewildered and panic-stricken flock. Crowds of people of all conditions spend whole nights in supplication, while large numbers of houses are left without drainage. There seems to be no hope but in compulsory vaccination, strictly enforced, and an improvement in the sanitary condition of the city. The original objection to vaccination, that it conveyed the diseased blood of beasts into the veins of human beings, has been modified by doctors in Montreal raising the objection that the means of preventing one disease was the insidious instrument of propagating a number of others. The alarm reinforced the superstitious fears of the ignorant, and the result is seen in the havoc which the scourge is making. The objectors did not deny, and could not deny, that vaccination had greatly reduced the rate of mortality in every country where its use became general. That it is necessary to obtain pure lymph no one would think of denying, and with reasonable care no incidental damage from vaccination need be feared. Like all precautions of which the necessity has ceased to appear urgent, Jenner's discovery has, in several countries, ceased to be availed of as generally as it should be. Even England was recently threatened with a new outbreak of small-pox; but the appearance of a real danger caused a speedy resort to known measures of safety. The disease will probably spread far in the Province of Quebec, where the conditions are favourable to its propagation, and in Ontario precautions need to be taken. In vaccination and cleanliness alone can safety be found. The necessity for vaccination in Ontario seems scarcely to be realized as it should be, though the daily bulletins from Montreal should dispel any apathy which may exist. Where municipal inertia creates unnecessary risks, individual initiative can generally lead the way to safety.

In the *Fortnightly Review* for April, 1883, appeared an article by Lord Randolph Churchill, entitled "Elijah's Mantle," the subject of which was the unveiling of Lord Beaconsfield's statue. It contained a passage which subsequent events have rendered memorable. Lord Randolph Churchill was at that time caballing against Sir Stafford Northcote, with whom he now sits in the Cabinet; and he draws with a pen dipped in venom a contrast between Sir Stafford and Lord Beaconsfield. He then turns to Lord Salisbury, by whom also he says, with a sneer, the character of Lord Beaconsfield "was to some extent imperfectly appreciated," and observes that "for some reason or other an unknown master of the ceremonies had reserved to the Marquis the very secondary function of moving a vote of thanks to Sir Stafford Northcote for having unveiled the statue." Considering that Lord Salisbury had regarded Lord Beaconsfield with intense and unconcealed aversion, had written against him and his policy, and had been attacked by him in turn as a master of flouts, gibes and jeers, the unknown master of the ceremonies may have had a pretty good reason for his arrangement. There follow, however, the words to which special attention is called:—

"Speaking to the delegates of the various Conservative Associations on the eve of the ceremony, Lord Salisbury condemned in forcible language 'the temptation' which, he said, 'was very strong to many politicians to attempt to gain the victory by bringing into the lobby men whose principles were divergent and whose combined forces therefore could not lead to any wholesome victory.' Excellent moralizing, very suitable to the digestion of the country delegates, but one of those puritanical theories which party leaders are prone to preach on a platform, which has never guided for any length of time the action of politicians in the House of Commons, and which, whenever apparently put into practice, invariably results in weak and inane proceedings. *Discriminations between wholesome and unwholesome victories are idle and unpractical. Obtain the victory, know how to follow it up, leave the wholesomeness or unwholesomeness to critics.* Lord Salisbury, when he used the words quoted above, must have forgotten that a few hours later he was going to take part in unveiling the statue of a statesman whose whole political life was absolutely at variance with Lord Salisbury's maxim. The condemnation of a particular method of gaining political victories was in reality a condemnation of the political career of the Earl of Beaconsfield."

The last sentence must have been pleasant reading for Lord Rowton, if he is engaged in writing the life of Lord Beaconsfield. Truer words were never penned, for the great achievement of Lord Beaconsfield's career was the divorce, so far as his followers and his party were concerned, of politics from morality. To comment on the rest of the passage would be to gild gold and to paint the lily. It may safely be said that in the worst pages of the most immoral writer on politics, in the most cynical effusions of the lowest American demagogue, a parallel will not easily be found to this frank profession of dishonour. Yet, two years have sufficed to educate

the Marquis of Salisbury up to the mark of Lord Randolph Churchill. He has become Prime Minister by a coalition not with "men whose principles were divergent," but with the avowed enemies of the realm.

The writer of "Elijah's Mantle" proceeds to illustrate, historically, his view of Elijah's morality. "In 1852," he says, "Mr. Disraeli put Lord John Russell into a minority by allying himself with Lord Palmerston, and in 1857 Mr. Disraeli put Lord Palmerston into a minority by allying himself with Mr. Gladstone and the Radical Party. In 1858 Mr. Disraeli put Lord Palmerston into a second minority by following the lead of Mr. Milner Gibson and the Radicals. . . . In 1866 Mr. Disraeli, with the assistance of Lord Cranborne, placed Mr. Gladstone in a minority by allying himself with the Whigs, whose principles are even more divergent from the modern Conservatives than the principles of the Radical Party, and certainly any political victory in which Whigs bear a part must be to the last degree unwholesome and scrofulous. . . . Again, in 1873, Mr. Disraeli placed Mr. Gladstone in a minority by making a temporary alliance with the Radicals and the Irish." Lord Randolph Churchill has omitted the first instance of these tactics, which was the coalition with the Whigs and Radicals against Sir Robert Peel in 1846. And what was the practical result? One which it is eminently wholesome and anti-scrofulous to mark. In 1858 Lord Palmerston having been placed in a minority by the "fortuitous concurrence of atoms" appealed at once to the country and came back victorious. On the other occasion the gain to the Conservatives was a brief tenure of office on sufferance without power or honour, a sacrifice of the principles and character of the party, a speedy re-union of the opposing forces and a disastrous overthrow. Only once in his long life of strategy did Lord Beaconsfield lead his party into power, and that was in 1874, when there had been a genuine Conservative reaction, produced by no device of his, but by social and commercial causes entirely beyond his control, and when, moreover, Mr. Gladstone, by a hasty and ill-advised dissolution of Parliament, had thrown the game into the hands of his opponents. Had the Conservatives remained true to their fundamental principles and to Peel as their leader in 1846, there was nothing in the temper or the circumstances of the country to prevent power from being handed down through a succession of moderate Conservative statesmen from that hour to this. In fact if any one wishes to understand the weakness of intrigue in a country under Parliamentary government he will do well to study the history of the Conservative Party in England from 1846 to 1880. We shall now see whether the epilogue will not be in keeping with the play.

So long as the public morality of a nation is sound, there is hope. Not only is there hope, there is the certainty of ultimate salvation whatever errors the statesmen of the day may commit. When public morality ceases to be sound, all is lost. If for the honour which was the guiding star of Chatham, Pitt, Canning, Grey and Peel, were to be substituted the maxims which Lord Beaconsfield put in practice, and Lord Randolph Churchill preaches, the story of British greatness would be closed. Every one, then, who feels an interest in the fortunes of England must have watched with extreme anxiety to see whether the intrigue between Tories and the Parnellites would be followed by a moral recoil. By a moral recoil it has been followed. Honourable Conservatives, and the more independent organs of the Conservative Press, have entered a protest, and a loud one. Lord Spencer has received an ovation in which Conservatives as well as Liberals have borne a part, and Lord Salisbury and Sir Michael Hicks-Beach have found themselves compelled to pay to him at least the tribute of hypocrisy. Sir Michael Hicks-Beach even essayed to deny that there had been an understanding with the Parnellites, but the falsehood died upon his lips, and he took refuge in a sorry jest. Still it must be confessed that the selfish madness of faction has half stifled the voice of honour, and that in this, of all respects the most vital, England is in no small peril. Now it is that the eye turns wistfully to the receding figure of Mr. Gladstone. Wonder has often been expressed that a High Church Anglican who makes Ritualists Bishops should receive as he does the ardent support of Presbyterians, Methodists and Baptists. The reason is one of which the Presbyterians, Methodists and Baptists as Christians and patriots need not be ashamed. It is that Mr. Gladstone, amidst all his changes of opinion and connection, has been steadfastly loyal to morality. Flaws there may be in his statesmanship, mistakes he may have made. His Irish policy of conciliation may have failed to conciliate; his treatment of the Egyptian question may have been weak; his cultivation of the French Alliance may have been illstarred; his tactics as a leader may not have been masterly; but he has never swerved from what he believed to be the line of his public duty. Faithfully, to the best of his