

John Bright began his public life as a Temperance Lecturer, and it is understood that he is now a total abstainer; we may safely say that a stauncher friend of temperance does not live. In the great cities of England he has seen intemperance on the largest scale and its evil consequences in their most heart-rending form. He has, moreover, been always struggling as a political reformer against the overweening power of the Licensed Victuallers, whose influence is constantly cast on the side of the Tories and in favour of a policy which points to war. Yet his sagacity preserves him from the error of Prohibitionism. When he is invited, as he has repeatedly been, to lend his sanction to movements in favour of compulsory legislation, his answer is "form opinion by moral influences and all will go well." "At present," he says in one of his letters, "a few persons clamour for legislation which the country is not prepared for and which it will not bear. The consequence of this is failure, there being much contention and no result. The friend of temperance should leave Parliament and form opinion, trusting that when opinion is formed whatsoever is judicious in legislation will naturally and easily follow." His strong sense of justice conspires with his practical wisdom in rejecting the violent measures which some enthusiasts propose. "I cannot consent," he says in another letter, "to the rough-and-ready way of dealing with the question which many friends of temperance in their zeal seem disposed to advocate. I think they would inflict a great injustice in many cases, and might create a strong reactionary feeling against their own principles." If the results of experience in the United States had been distinctly brought before him he would perhaps have couched his warning in still stronger terms.

THE *Pall Mall Gazette's* "Committee" has made its report, which the *Pall Mall* exultingly prints in an edition with a deep black border. No doubt there has been a tremendous sale and a glorious renewal of the feast of uncleanness. The report, as might have been foretold, is a mere nullity. The members of the Committee avow that they from the first decided to exclude any inquiry into the charges against particular men or classes of men, and against the police. Of course, as an amateur tribunal with no warrant for their proceedings but that of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, they could not have gone into anything personal without exposing themselves to a libel suit, which, if they had been caught tripping in any case, would probably have been brought. Yet without going into personal charges, or charges against classes or against the police, how could they possibly pronounce upon that part of the *Pall Mall's* alleged revelations to which alone special importance attaches. That infamous places of resort must be supplied with victims by infamous means no Archbishops or Cardinals were needed to tell us; the dreadful fact, as we said before, has been repeatedly brought under public notice in connection with the activity of the police, and it was recognized by a Bill which had thrice passed the House of Lords—that supposed assembly of "minotaurs"—and was before the Commons when the *Pall Mall* pounced on the material for a sensation. Even as to this part of the matter we are left apparently to guess whether the evidence which convinced the Committee was that of witnesses who would be deemed trustworthy by an unimpassioned world, or that of the Salvation Army and of female crusaders against the Contagious Diseases Act. It is not stated whether the Committee called the editor of the *Pall Mall* before them and examined him as to the position of his journal and other things which might throw light upon his motives. The Committee have added nothing, so far as we can see, to our knowledge of the subject. Nor is it likely that they will have given any practical help to society in dealing with this most fearful of its maladies. But they have effectually served, by the part which they have been trepanned into playing, the objects of the *Pall Mall Gazette*; they have sanctioned the conduct of that journal, and of any journal which may choose to stimulate its flagging circulation by the same means, in polluting the thoughts and poisoning the moral atmosphere of the community; they have given currency to the truth of the vague charge of hideous guilt against persons and classes the truth of which they declare themselves not qualified to investigate; they have made themselves partly responsible for an attack on public peace and happiness, the consequences of which we begin to see, but are unable as yet to measure. Like a witch in a storm, Mrs. Booth of the Salvation Army joyously rides the gale of scandal with high ecclesiastics at her side, and a Royal letter, which it was simple indeed to fancy that she would treat as confidential, in her hand. The editor of the *Louisville Courier*, meanwhile, having had the *Pall Mall* revelations cabled to him at great expense from London, declines, upon inspection, to use them, honourably preferring a heavy loss to the publication of such obscenities. In this affair, it must be owned, the Press has shown itself at least as good a guardian of practical morality as the ecclesiastics.

THE fortitude of President Cleveland as a reformer is being put to a severe test. Of the hundred thousand offices, great or small, about twenty thousand are now brought under the Civil Service Law. With regard to these the President has only to administer the law resolutely, and resolutely he administers it. But for the rest the fight is still going on between the Spoils system and that of tenure during good behaviour. Hendricks, the Vice-President, is a thoroughgoing party man of the pure breed and the old stamp, an upholder of the Spoils system and the patron of all the disaffection which the President's reform policy has created among the jobbers and corruptionists of the party. It seems that he would have been the party choice for President had it not been absolutely necessary to secure the Independent Vote. Indiana, in which he reigns supreme, is considered indispensable to the re-election which it is taken for granted that Cleveland, not being exempt from the ordinary human tendencies, must desire. But Jones, the Postmaster of Indiana, a political henchman of Hendricks, is setting at naught in the most flagrant manner the President's reform policy, turning out without cause assigned all Republican office holders in his department, whether they have taken an active part in politics or not, and putting thoroughgoing Democrats in their places. Some of his appointments appear to be not only partisan but discreditable. Will President Cleveland have the courage to interpose with effect, to defy Satan in the person of Hendricks, to remove Jones if he refuses to mend his ways, and to risk the loss of Indiana? This is the question which all Independents and Reformers are asking with the greatest anxiety. President Cleveland's character as a reformer, they seem to think, must stand or fall by the result. But they ought not to be too exacting. The President was elected mainly by the votes of his own party. The Independents turned the balance in his favour, but without the Democratic Party there would have been no balance to turn. He cannot be expected at once and completely to break with the main body of his supporters or entirely to throw off the allegiance to party which the Independents themselves still profess under all ordinary circumstances to maintain. The Spoils system has prevailed for half a century; the Republican Party, to which the Independents still consider themselves as belonging, has been reaping the benefit of it without restraint or compunction for twenty years. It is not wonderful that the other party, on its recovery of power after so long an exclusion, should expect to have its turn of patronage, or that the leader should have great difficulty in repressing the cupidity and rejecting the claims of his followers. That President Cleveland is a thoroughly sincere reformer nobody can doubt, nor can anybody doubt that he is a brave and resolute man; what he fails to do is probably beyond the power of any one in his situation, and to throw him over for not doing it would be folly and ingratitude. It is to be hoped, however, that the President will see his way to resolute action. The evil elements of his party must by this time be as completely estranged as possible; his hope lies in the growing attachment to him of the good men of both parties and of all who only want honest government. Let him dare to lose his life as nominee of a party and he will find it as the choice of the nation.

AMIDST the general shower of bombshells, theological, social and political, flying in every direction, one from the gun of Mr. James Beaty, M.P., has exploded in the camp of the clergy. In an elaborate treatise Mr. Beaty contends that paying the pastor is unscriptural and he threatens the whole clerical profession with the stoppage of its salaries. His wisdom, as well as his compassion for the pastor and the pastor's family, would probably restrain him from carrying into effect this resolution at once and by a single stroke, since the immediate result would certainly be the advent of chaos in the religious world. Mr. Beaty himself, we understand, belongs to a congregation organized on the primitive Christian model without any pastor at all; but he must see that such an organization cannot be set on foot in an hour and that the great mass of the Christian people is totally incapable of the effort. It is not difficult for him to prove that there was no paid clergy in primitive times, for in primitive times there was no clergy at all. Such at least is the verdict of historical research, though the contrary is believed by Catholics and High Churchmen on other than historical grounds. But it must be remembered that in its earliest stage Christianity was communistic, a primitive system to which Mr. Beaty would scarcely desire to return; and we may safely assume that the expense of ministrations, whatever it might be, as well as that of almsgiving, was defrayed out of the common fund. St. Paul distinctly asserts the claim of a preacher of the Gospel to maintenance, though he chooses to waive it in his own case, and the seventy were sent forth without scrip or provision of their own. The question which Mr. Beaty's essay opens, however, is likely to become critical in the not very distant future. As