

an important qualification in these days, when the squire, like other people, has become restless and, instead of living among his tenants and the peasantry, spends a great part of his time as a pleasure-seeker in London or on the Continent. Industrial antagonism on the other hand would lead the farm-labourers to vote against the farmer, on whom he was the other day making war as a Unionist under the generalship of Joseph Arch; and if the tenant farmer adheres, as he has hitherto very steadfastly done, to the standard of the landlord, there will be a cross action of the attractive and repulsive forces the upshot of which it is difficult to forecast. A strong appeal to material interests, such as the promise of a cottage and garden rent free could hardly fail to turn the scale. The condition of Hodge is still not such as to put him above the influence of a bribe; and a bribe—any bribe that will bring the vote—the Radical leader is prepared to offer.

“WHAT has hitherto been the vital distinction between English parties will disappear, and the contest will henceforth be between two organizations, one in name Tory, the other Radical, but both in character equally Radical, and bidding against each other by democratic and socialistic measures for the suffrages of the masses.” Thus do English journals forecast the politics of the future, assuming, and with too much probability, that the violent element in each faction will prevail, and that moderation and patriotism will be eliminated on both sides. Supposing the forecast to be correct, while it may not be easy to predict the immediate issue of the conflict, it is easy enough to predict the ultimate result. On the part of the Tories democracy is factitious, and is adopted or affected merely as a desperate device for the purpose of saving aristocracy and the institutions, political or ecclesiastical, which aristocracy regards as its outworks. On the part of the Radicals the democracy is genuine, and the genuine is always the strong. Tory concession must come to an end as soon as aristocracy, or anything fundamental to it is touched. To Radical concession there is no limit, and the Radical will go on bidding higher and higher when the fund of the Tory is exhausted. But the fact is that on the most vital of all questions the bounding-line of Tory demagogism lies near at hand and full in view. If Local Government is the first question on the order book, the second is Land. It is more than possible even that the Land Question may be raised first. Agrarian revolution is not only in the air, it has commenced in Ireland, and is advancing with rapid strides. The Radicals are preparing to push with all their force, and with the tide of popular opinion evidently and strongly in their favour, legislation which will break up the great estates, if even it stops of partial confiscation. But this to Toryism is the last ditch. Pedigrees longer and more illustrious than most of those of the British peers would be a frail foundation for the House of Lords when the great estates were gone. The catastrophe then of Tory Democracy, in other words, of the attempt to keep aristocracy alive by demagogism, is merely a question of time, and probably of no long time. Such strategy will most likely precipitate the fall of the Conservative Party, while it cannot fail to strip of national respect and confidence the leaders of the class in which the force of Conservatism resides.

THE life of a politician is now trying to the health. So we should infer from the number of those whose strength fail and from the process of reconstruction which our present Cabinet is always undergoing. Yet Sir Francis Hincks managed to live to a patriarchal age, and has died at last not of decay but of an accidental disease. Perhaps in his youth and early manhood, while there was a good deal of rough work and even of violence, the exactions of public life were less severe and there was less in it that was trying to the nerves and destruction of sleep. The quondam associate of Lyon Mackenzie and the editor of the *Examiner* was the very last of his political generation. He had taken part in a struggle which had a real object, and had enlisted in a party when the dividing lines between the parties were clear and strong. But he lived into a time in which, the questions of 1837 having entirely receded into the background, real objects of contention no longer existed and the parties degenerated into connections competing for place and manufacturing artificial issues as the ostensible subjects of their strife. In the tissue of intrigues and personal combinations which ensued he found himself in office with the political heirs of the men against whom he had fought in his youth. The name Liberal-Conservative, which, in common with them he assumed, is aptly expressive of an absence of any definite opinions and of a desire to attract votes from both sides. The conversion of ex-revolutionists into reactionists is not uncommon; in the case of Sir Francis Hincks it could hardly fail to be facilitated by Knighthood and a pension; nor is it often that there is found in the convert a decent recollection of the past. Sir Francis understood all financial questions thoroughly well and wrote upon them with great clearness and force: in that line he has not left his peer among us.

“THE expression of public sentiment on the occasion of General Grant's funeral may have seemed overdone; but the sad circumstances of his later life should be taken into the account. There was also a certain feeling of compunction at the harshness with which he was treated while in the Presidency. Mistakes he made, but some things he did which were very good and statesmanlike. He resisted the tendency to take vengeance upon the South; he vetoed the Inflation Bill; he withstood the attempt to raise a storm of Anti-British feeling in the Alabama Case and gave his voice in favour of arbitration. In the contrast drawn between his military and his civil career there is truth, but there is also falsehood: he had a native preference for strong and genuine men, a dislike of the weak and foppish. His antagonism to Mr. Sumner, though it made him enemies, was creditable to him in the judgment even of friends and admirers of Mr. Sumner, if they understood the case. His defects were the defects of his qualities. It was his misfortune to trust too blindly when he trusted at all.” Such in substance are the comments of an American who, though friendly to Grant, is as well worth hearing on the question as any man can be. If some distaste has been shown for this vast pomp of death it is partly because people had been condemned for many months before to read the daily details of Grant's sick bed, partly because the flood-gates of obituary eloquence being inevitably opened, a torrent of false rhetoric and spurious sentiment was poured forth. In our friend's version of Grant's political career there is, we doubt not, much truth. While the faults committed, especially in supporting corrupt or unworthy adherents against public opinion, were serious, the services rendered in the three cases specified were real and great. Opposition to the prodigious egotism of Mr. Sumner, who to salve his own wounded vanity would have wrecked arbitration and perhaps plunged two nations into war, stands in no need of apology in our eyes. Yet soldiers, if they have had no other training, seldom make good statesmen. Cæsar and Cromwell had been politicians before they were soldiers. The character of Grant and that of the Duke of Wellington had a good deal in common. In both there was the same iron fidelity to duty, the same strong but narrow good sense. Wellington would perhaps even have been capable of forming a prejudice against Motley because he parted his hair in the middle. The Duke's opportunities of educating himself in politics had been much greater than Grant's. He had sat in Parliament, and had held subordinate office. Some of his Peninsular despatches show a remarkable power of dealing with quasi-political and financial subjects. Nor can it be said of him any more than of Grant that he did the country no service as a statesman. He was able, without dishonour, to give the word for retreat, and he gave it in the case of Catholic Emancipation and again in the case of the Corn Laws. Yet few will doubt that it would have been better for his reputation had he remained Commander-in-Chief or entered the cabinet only as Minister of War.

ANY mystery that may have hung over Farquharson's defalcation is dispelled by the failure of four brokers with whom he had connections. The brokers were no doubt the agents he used in carrying on transactions by which he lost the money of the Munster Bank, for which he figures as a defaulter. When a bank manager is found speculating in stocks it may be taken for granted that he has entered the road on which not one in every hundred passes safely to his destination. La Touche, the manager of the Munster Bank, died within two years, when Farquharson appears to have got full control in connection with directors whose dealings with the trust funds under their charge became a subject of public scandal. The original La Touche, who started a private bank on which the Munster Bank was founded, about ten years ago, was a French *émigré* whom political exigencies drove into exile; and the first manager of the joint-stock bank was one of his descendants. At his death a dishonest manager came into contact with directors whose needs tempted them to borrow from the Bank on inadequate security, and whose want of scruple did the rest. It is a farce to suppose that a bank director should scrutinize with necessary care the paper which he himself offers for discount, and if several directors be borrowers like himself, they may be expected to become dumb on the subject of the borrowing of any one of them. A very necessary safeguard is removed the moment a board of directors acts on the rule of dispensing loans to its own members.

“IRELAND'S worst enemy” is now Mr. Bright. That bad eminence he has attained at a bound by protesting against an outrage upon the character of Lord Spencer which must be repudiated as dishonourable to the country by every Irishman in whose heart honour has its seat. Throughout his long public life Mr. Bright has been the steady, ardent and powerful advocate of justice to the Irish people. He has done more for the promotion of practical reform in Ireland than has ever been done by