

must know that since Mr. Stead became its editor it has been trading on sensations. The blockade of the Criminal Law Amendment Bill amidst the general obstruction in the Commons furnished a cue, and the inquiry on which that Bill was originally founded is probably the only authentic source of information. Further information Mr. Stead sought, it appears, by going about and drinking champagne with the girls in the brothels, whose truthful tongues, set wagging by the wine, gave brilliant catalogues of their paramours, including some of the highest names in the land. No better warrant does the great champion of morality appear to have had for sowing the most infamous imputations broadcast over whole classes and even pointing them at defenceless men. But it was certain that the prattle of brothels would not be accepted as proof of the general indictment without a specific case. A specific case, therefore, was manufactured, with the aid of a vile woman, by the abduction of Eliza Armstrong, who had the honour thus to be sacrificed on the altar of social reform. The circulation of the *Pall Mall Gazette* went up by leaps and bounds; its disclosures were translated by prurient curiosity into all tongues; and its editor proclaimed the commercial success of his enterprise in the most blaring tones of exultant self-advertisement. Whether any higher motives mingled with those which were thus virtually avowed is a curious question of psychology which, not being familiar with Mr. Stead's moral idiosyncrasies, we must forbear discussing, but which we should be perfectly willing to determine on the charitable side. The one thing which it is important to note is that for the hideous suspicions with which society, not in England alone, has been filled, no basis of fact has been produced. Not only has no basis of fact been produced, but the absence of genuine proof has been practically admitted in the most emphatic manner by the recourse to a criminal fabrication. There are sores enough on the body of humanity, and sources enough of ill-feeling between classes without adding to them the phantoms of a disturbed or a sinister imagination. Suspicions of drunkenness have in the same way been scattered here by the enthusiasts of Prohibition, and we have been told that there are seven thousand, or even ten thousand, deaths from alcohol among us every year. To the new magazine entitled *Man*, which has just been brought out at Ottawa under the editorship of a medical man, are usefully appended mortuary statistics for the principal places in the Dominion. The total number of deaths in the month of September was: at Montreal, 1,220; at Toronto, 187; at Quebec, 193; at Hamilton, 58. The number of deaths from alcoholism was: at Toronto, two; at the other places, none.

THE election of Mr. Hill as Governor of the State of New York is a serious event, and looked at first like a catastrophe. As a Democrat, Mr. Hill belongs nominally to the President's party, but the two men are members of two different sections, whose conjunction is not less hollow and incongruous than that of the friends and enemies of liberty in the Liberal Party here. Mr. Hill is an old ally of William Tweed, and entirely worthy, as it appears, of that auspicious association. He was nominated by Tammany and the Irish Democracy openly and explicitly as an opponent of what they style "the humbug of Civil Service Reform." His opponent, Mr. Davenport, was a staunch Reformer, as well as a man of the highest personal integrity, and in every way fitted for the post. The contrast between the character of the two candidates was so great that the Democrats seemed once more to have saved their opponents by a blunder. The Independent Republicans, or Mugwumps, as party fanaticism christens them, were, of course, ardent in support of Davenport, and they confidently expected his election. Mr. Hill, however, is elected, and by a majority considerably larger than that by which, with the assistance of the Independents, Cleveland carried the State in the Presidential election. Corruption, therefore, appears to have triumphed. The explanation, however, seems to be that the Irish transferred themselves back from Blaine, for whom they had voted as an enemy of England, to the normal objects of their allegiance, Tammany and Spoils, while a number of Stalwart-Republicans stayed at home in dudgeon because Davenport was the candidate of the schismatic Mugwumps. The Prohibitionist vote also was large, as in slack tides of party it is apt to be, and it increases almost entirely at the expense of the Republicans. We may lay aside the fear, then, that political morality has suffered a serious relapse. In the meantime, the refusal of Stalwarts to go to the polls with Independents is another step in the break-up of party. "The Mugwumps," says their leader in *Harper's Weekly*, "will support no candidate merely because he is a Republican or a Democrat, but only because he is an honest and competent representative of their opinions." If they will stick to this they may rid their country, and perhaps help considerably to rid other countries, not only of the Spoils System but of the root out of which that and many another poisonous plant has grown.

AFTER reading the accounts of the French elections from France itself we are disposed to revert to our original view of the matter. One ingredient, no doubt, in the popular indignation against the Republican Government was the ill success of the filibustering operations in the East; their ill success, not their iniquity, for the announcement of a great slaughter of the Annamites has since been hailed with universal delight. The bad state of the finances may be taken also to have had its effect. But the main cause lay deeper than those. It was the reaction against the violence of Radicalism generally and particularly against the atheistical onslaught upon what is still the popular religion. The same thing has occurred before and has occurred elsewhere. It occurred in the first French Revolution, where the recoil from Jacobinical atheism helped Napoleon to mount the throne, and enabled him, with general acquiescence, to restore the Church; and it occurred the other day in Belgium. A mere reverse on a distant scene of action or a deficit which awakens no very serious alarm would not be enough to account for a change which almost amounts to a revolution. In the last election the Conservatives only polled 1,789,767 votes. In these they have polled three millions and a half. Some of the details are not less significant than the general result, and in Paris itself, the most whimsical of constituencies, and that in which the "Red Fool-Fury" reigns, there has been an immense Conservative gain. The emancipation of opinion from Jacobin terrorism is perhaps the most important consequence of all. The Conservatives elected are professed adherents of Monarchy under one name or another. It does not follow that the people in electing them wished to overturn the Republic. What the majority wished probably was that the Republic should be administered on Conservative principles, and that there should be an end of legislative attacks on religion and on social morality. They wanted, in short, not a Monarchical revolution, but a breathing-time from revolution altogether. It was a protest of society, the family and industry against the violence of demagogism and faction, against incendiary ambition and an anarchy of chimeras. The result of the supplementary elections, which has been disappointing to the Conservatives, seems to be an indication on the part of the people that what they desire is moderation, not a Monarchical revolution. The Republicans will still have a very large majority in the Chamber if the two sections can manage to combine. But the Radical leaders are such maniacs that combination will be difficult, and having come out of the elections better than the Opportunists, they are not likely to be moderate in their demands. A Jacobin is violent, arbitrary and sanguinary, or he is nothing.

THE descendants of the Huguenots have been celebrating the bi-centenary of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes. It is an old story, but it was a terrible one in its day, and even the annals of the Church of Rome contain few worse. By the monarch whom Rome delighted to honour, under the instigation of his devout wife and his Jesuit confessor, thousands of the best and most industrious citizens of France, guilty of nothing but of not being of the same religion as the King and Pope, were slaughtered, tortured, sent to the galleys, pillaged of all they possessed; and hundreds of thousands were driven into exile. "Forbidden," says the writer of a good paper in an English journal, "to assemble in public worship under the penalty of torture or death for the men and imprisonment for women; or to worship privately under the penalty of being sent to the galleys for life; precluded from singing their psalms or hymns by the threat of fine, imprisonment or the galleys; forbidden to instruct their children in the faith; commanded to send their boys to Jesuit schools, their daughters to nunneries, at their own expense; their churches demolished; their pastors ordered to leave the country within fifteen days on pain of death; themselves forbidden to pass the frontier or to attempt to escape from France; their marriages by their own ministers declared to be illegal; refused burial for their dead; their Bibles and books of devotion burnt; forbidden to exercise any profession, to fill any public office or even to work as servants or artisans without a certificate that they had become Catholics;—the Huguenots who determined to be faithful to their convictions were hunted like wild beasts." This persecution was nearly contemporary with, but prior to, the enactment of the Penal Laws against Catholics in Ireland, and Irish Catholic troopers served in the persecuting armies of Louis XIV. as they had served in the persecuting armies of the House of Austria. If anybody is to be held responsible for the past all must be held responsible alike. The present rulers of France would be surprised if they were called to account for the Revocation of the Edict and the Dragonnades. Is it less unjust to call the British Government or the British people of the present day to account for the intolerant severities of the Penal Code? The Penal Code was after all only a ruthless act of