

is the real curse; whiskey it is that maddens and that engenders the fatal craving so often transmitted to the hapless offspring of the drunkard. You may think that it would be better still if, for beer and light wine, people would substitute tea and coffee. Upon that point medical men are by no means agreed; but, at all events, you have to deal with human nature. If there is anything which experience has proved it is, that the tastes and habits of mankind cannot be altered all at once by legislation, whether in the form of a Czar's Ukase or an Act of Parliament. They cannot be altered all at once, but if treated in a reasonable way they may be gradually modified for the better. Repeated trials, both in the States and in Canada, have shown that Prohibition is practically a mode of driving the people from the lighter drinks to whiskey, which is the most easily smuggled, and, at the same time, of substituting a contraband for a licensed and regulated trade. Prohibitionists talk of principle, but can any sound principle bid us of two evils choose the greater?

THE *Globe* is perfectly right in enjoining its readers, when they study English affairs, to keep always in view the difference between London opinion and the opinion of the nation. Totally false impressions may be formed from the cable reports unless this distinction is borne in mind. The metropolitan press, so far from representing the nation, has practically less influence than the great journals of the North and West, which are really powerful in their own districts, while the London papers are read by many more for their news than for their editorials, as people in the States read the *New York Herald*. Jingoism is a special product of the London Clubs and Music Halls, which throughout the negotiations with Russia have been hectoring and raving while the country in general has been watching in comparative calm the efforts of the Government to find an honourable mode of averting war. The ruffianism which assails Mr. Gladstone in the House of Commons, and sometimes even in the street, is a secretion of the same social glands. Anywhere out of London he would be received by men of all parties with respect. It is remarkable, and has always appeared to us a strong practical argument in favour of an extended suffrage, that the London Clubs should be the chosen rendezvous of unreason. They are full of the very men who ought to be peculiarly endowed with the wisdom of this world, and yet no mob can be much more senseless. The *Times*, under that prince of opportunist journalism, John Delane, recorded their opinions from hour to hour with the fidelity of the finest barometer: and it will be found that the *Times* under John Delane, while upon May Fair and Rotten Row questions it was invariably in the right, was upon all the great questions, national and European, from the Corn Laws to the American Civil War, not less invariably in the wrong. A statesman who had steadily followed its guidance would have committed every serious error both in home and foreign affairs for which an opportunity was afforded by the circumstances of those times.

It is not only by its Metropolitanism that the Cable is apt to mislead; in the circle within which the correspondents move personal likes and dislikes have their influence. We have been reading of late constant disparagement of Lord Granville which comes to us through New York. He is dilatory, weak, irresolute, blundering and responsible for all the humiliations which we are desired to believe, in spite of our senses, that England has undergone. It is a compliment far short of apotheosis to say that in the opinion of impartial judges Lord Granville is of Mr. Gladstone's lieutenants about the best. A great statesman he can hardly be called; at least his mind has not been much given to the political questions which divide parties; but he is a great man of the world, with an element in his character, which perhaps does him no harm, of the sporting man: for his first office was the Mastership of the Buckhounds. In society he is allowed to be delightful, and no man makes an after-dinner speech with more playfulness and grace. As leader for many years of a minority in the House of Lords, engaged in steering Liberal measures through a Tory House, he has shown consummate tact, patience, temper and address. As a diplomatist he is not likely to have been deserted by the qualities which have served him so well in Parliament. In both lines of action the evidence of results is in his favour. The Liberal measures have been carried, while amidst a world in arms, and filled with rivalries, jealousies and sinister combinations, England, with Lord Granville for her foreign minister, has so far preserved peace with honour. It is not always by published despatches that we can best estimate the skill of a diplomatist who ought to look not to a controversial triumph but to the practical object of the negotiations; and the foreign minister of a despotism who is at liberty to pursue the practical object alone has an advantage over the foreign minister of a democracy who has to satisfy his many masters that the case has been effectively argued on their side. Lord Granville, though good-natured and

genial, is high-bred and of the old school: he may not have made himself so accessible as public men of the new school to enterprising correspondents of American journals, and their accounts of him may be coloured by their sense of that defect.

SOME one has been asking John Bright whether England will return to Protection. When America returns to Slavery is Bright's reply. In England what did Protection mean? It meant a heavy tax on food. Can anybody imagine that when food is heavily taxed the people are better fed? Protectionists are always pointing the finger of warning at the temporary depression of this or the other trade or manufacture among the numberless trades and manufactures of Great Britain. Would the sufferers be better off if every loaf of bread cost them half as much again as it does? Would that give them higher power of production or a better market for their goods? There are strikes occasionally in England. There are just as many in the United States: you may see in an American paper the announcement of half-a-dozen in a row; and the other day in the mining country there was a strike which assumed the gravity of a petty civil war. Nothing can be more certain than that the system of Protection, by the artificial stimulus which it gives, aggravates the fluctuations from which industrial disturbances arise. The distress and over-crowding in the low quarters of London are also cited as proofs of the fatal effects of Free Trade. In a city with four millions of inhabitants the amount of misery is sure to be large, though it bears no proportion to the amount of wealth and comfort. Accounts are every day coming to us of destitution in Paris fully as sad as those of destitution in London, though Paris does not like London receive a continual inflow of poor Irish and refugee Jews. Yet France is not a Free Trade country. If the Corn Laws were reinforced, which is what is meant in the case of England by a return to Protection, rentals would again be bloated just as the gains of manufacturers are bloated by protective duties on goods, and the people would sink again into the hunger and despondency which were their lot before 1846.

THE position of the Conservative Party in England offers a curious spectacle to the political observer. Its members in all the periodicals and journals go on debating before an edified world what its principles ought to be. After all the strange births of political history, a party openly in quest of a set of principles to furnish a reason for its existence has still the charm of novelty. In the *Fortnightly Review* Mr. Bartley, lately the chief Tory agent, propounds his views as to the exigencies of the situation. In the first place, he calls for a new set of men, men not of the privileged class—Tory demagogues, in plain words—in place of the aristocratic leaders. In the second place, he thinks it necessary that the impulse for the future should come not from above but from below, that the present relation between the chiefs and the mass should be reversed as unsuited to these stirring times, and that the tail henceforth should move the head. This is enough in itself to give a Conservative county member food for reflection. But it is nothing to what follows. The programme of the new Conservatism, Mr. Bartley intimates, will be a radical change of the land law and a drastic reform of the House of Lords, while he not obscurely hints that the Church must be popularized or abolished, and that the tenure of the Crown for the future will be dependent on the personal merit of the wearer. The Irishman thought that his ride in the sedan-chair with the bottom out, saving the honour of the thing, was very like walking, and a Tory may well think that Mr. Bartley's platform, saving its Conservatism, is very like the creed of a Radical. "The welfare of the country," says Mr. Bartley, "will be the Conservative cry for the future." It will also be, and already is, the cry of Mr. Bradlaugh. Attempts have been made to modernize Judaism and to adapt Mahometanism to the spirit of the times; in both cases with indifferent success; and Tory-Democracy appears to be an undertaking of the same kind. Practically, however, the object is not to compile a right set of principles, but to find or make a ladder by which a certain set of men may mount to power. Let the Tory leaders be once installed in office and the ladder, at least the democratic part of it, will soon be kicked down. The Marquis of Salisbury is not going to reform the House of Lords, to do away with primogeniture, entail and settlement, to give the Church her choice between popularization and abolition, or to make the succession to the Crown dependent upon personal merit.

MR. BARTLEY, however, if his soul is vexed by the continuance at the head of the party of the old men, has no reason to complain of the retention of the old manner. In former days dignity of language, a reserve which denotes a deep sense of responsibility, an avoidance of everything violent and demagogic, were the characteristics of a Conservative statesman.