

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT is always a strong and interesting, though not always a conciliatory or persuasive speaker. His address to the Young Liberals, at Seaforth, is a good specimen of his style. It is notable among other things for a very frank avowal of a partisan standard of public morality. "Gentleman," said Sir Richard, "I am neither a purist nor a Puritan. I recognise the fact that politics is war, and many things are lawful, at least excusable, in war which have to be sharply dealt with in time of peace." This is the principle on which all party politicians act, but which few of them so ingenuously profess. Perhaps, indeed, the man who ingenuously professes it acts upon it rather less than most of the fraternity. We wish Sir Richard had given us some examples of the special indulgence accorded to unscrupulousness by the political code. Would he hold that it covered a politic affectation of sympathy with Riel or with Parnell, for the purpose of capturing the French or Irish vote? Would he hold that it covered the practice of setting spies upon the personal and social movements of opponents? In war the aim is mutual destruction; and it is only because mutual destruction is the aim that departures from the peace standard of public morality are allowed. In politics, as the science of government, common benefit is the aim, and a politician is no more warranted by the nature of his calling in departing from the rules of probity or veracity than is a practitioner of law or medicine. Let Sir Richard, instead of saying that politics is war say that Party is war, and he will call attention to a most important fact. Party is nothing but a survival of the primeval and savage lust of fighting, under a mitigated form. Its object, like that of ordinary war, is not common benefit, but mutual destruction. The type of the partisan, as has been truly said, is the Irishman who breaks the head of other Irishmen in a faction fight between the "One Year Olds" and the "Two Year Olds," or between the Caravats and Shanavests. No man can possibly be at once a true patriot and a good partisan. Nor can Party fail to be extinguished by the scientific spirit, should the scientific spirit ever extend itself to the political sphere. Sir Richard Cartwright recommends the Young Liberals of Seaforth to provide themselves with a good selection of works on history and social science. He gives them dangerous advice if he wishes their allegiance to Party to remain unimpaired. For their studies, if pursued with an open mind, will certainly lead them to the conclusion that faction is unworthy of civilised men, and that it has always been the ruin of States. Among their works on history will, of course, be included Hallam, who will tell them in his quiet, sarcastic way, that the best of all party watchwords is an unmeaning name, such as Caravat or Shanavest, Tory or Grit, because it makes no demand upon intelligence and admits of no compromise.

THE authorities of the Methodist Church, having closely identified themselves with the Evangelists, have very properly inquired into the circumstances, of somewhat sinister aspect, disclosed by the Small-Steinau correspondence. The explanation which they have elicited appears to be perfectly satisfactory, so far as any charge or suspicion of pecuniary dishonesty is concerned. But the revelations as to the "unhappy past" of the Evangelist's life are such as we cannot help thinking ought to make the people cautious in accepting him all at once as a teacher of teachers in the Church of Christ. Our previous remark, that there is some reason to fear lest Revivalism should become a trade, certainly loses no force from the publication of this episode.

ONE good thing, at all events, the Richmond Labour Convention has done. It has appropriated a sum of money for an experiment in Co-operation. There is nothing like experiment. If the workingmen find on trial that they can do without the resources or the guidance of the capitalist, and they can divide among themselves that which is now paid him as interest on his capital and salary for his superintendence, all will be well. If they do not succeed, they will have to admit that the present arrangement is necessary, and is not the wicked device of a horde of marauding tyrants, upheld by an iniquitous social system. For our part, we most heartily wish the experiment success, as we wish success to every experiment, either in co-operation strictly so-called, or in associating the interests of the workingmen, by whatever method, more closely with those of the employer. It is the existence of the hard and sharp line between the employer and the masses of the employed that constitutes the present danger, and enables the professional Labour agitator to keep up the war, and by which he subsists, and which threatens to bring great trouble, loss, and perhaps ultimately bloodshed on the world. Whatever tends to obliterate or to soften that line, either by erecting a class of workingmen who shall be their own employers, or by identifying the employed in interest with the employer, as is done in factories where the workingmen are shareholders, will be wholesome, and welcome as a diminution of our social peril.

ANOTHER project of the Richmond Convention, though less manifestly laudable, may have a wholesome effect in the end. It is proposed to institute a Labour Congress, elected by the Knights, which is to sit at Washington, by the side of the National Congress, considering all the measures brought before the National Congress, and exercising a vote in the interest of Labour on legislation. This will, at all events, define the situation, and show the people of the United States at what these organisations aim, and what is their attitude towards the rest of the community.

THE large vote polled by Mr. George has caused a good deal of consternation on both sides of the Atlantic. The fact is no doubt serious, but we cannot think that there is any cause for panic. With the exception of Chicago, and possibly of Pittsburg, New York is the place on this continent in which the spirit of social revolution is likely to be strongest. It contains an immense foreign element, imported from countries in which revolution, both social and political, has been raging, fresh, to a great extent, from the naturalisation mill, and unassimilated to American character. But it also contains a great amount of distress, the sufferers from which, without having any Socialistic tendencies of a theoretical or definite kind, will naturally follow any one who promises them relief. Visionary philanthropists, pained by the evils which they see around them, are drawn in the same direction, and it seems that a number of such persons actually cast their votes for George on this occasion. To all this must be added, as we said before, the excitability and levity of a great city population, which always craves for the sensational, and would run after Mr. George for no better reason than that he has made a great noise in the world. Mr. George has a high reputation for personal integrity, in spite of his advocating a robber theory; and it seems that not a few electors have supported him simply in the belief that he would stem municipal corruption, though, had he been tried, the result would probably have made them sensible of the difference between ingenuity in devising dreamy projects of social change and the capacity for carrying into effect practical reforms. It may be pretty safely assumed that not a tenth of the people who voted for Mr. George were adherents of his special theory, if they had ever read his books. Yet the majority against him, taking the votes cast for the other two candidates together, was overwhelming. There is still a pretty stout plank between civilisation on this continent and the devouring sea of socialistic revolution. Nevertheless, a vote of over sixty thousand cast, from motives however vague or mixed, for a man who proposes to confiscate all real estate, is a sign of the times. It admonishes the political parties to suspend their senseless strife, and combine their forces in defence of property, liberty, and civilisation, against the advancing hosts of social revolution, anarchy, and pillage.

MR. GOLDWIN SMITH concluded his answer to the address presented to him by the Loyal and Patriotic Union by reminding his audience that while to Canada, the native land of some of us, the adopted country of the rest, our allegiance and affection are primarily due, we have also a Mother Country which has ever been kind to us, which has the strongest claims on our gratitude, and with whose honour and greatness our honour and our position on this continent are intimately bound up. He appealed to all men of British blood not to desert the Mother Country in her hour of peril. Disclaiming any wish to revive anything like sectional feeling, or to cast disparagement on any nationality or religion different from his own, he pointed to the fact that the British race, after all, has been the great founder of the civilisation of this continent, having given the language, the laws, the institutions, the great organic principles of society. It was therefore entitled to its fair share of respect, and yet it seemed to be of all the races the least respected. You could not go into the States without seeing some paltry politician trying to make capital by vilifying England and the English. "We do not want," said Mr. Smith, "to domineer, but we do not want to be domineered over; we do not want to insult, neither do we want to be insulted; we do not want either to trample on others or to be trampled on ourselves. We are not disposed to allow the Parliament or the power of Canada to be used by the enemies of our Mother Country for the purpose of her dismemberment. If any politician tries so to use them, either for the purpose of capturing Irish support, or from any more sublime and ethereal considerations, it is to be hoped that he will have reason to acknowledge that there is a British as well as an Irish vote."

IN a chapter on the Fisheries question in his "Twenty Years of Congress," Mr. Blaine insists on the permanent character of the Treaty of 1782 between Great Britain and the new-formed United States, which recognised a right of the latter to continue the use of the fisheries of Canada and Newfoundland enjoyed by them while Colonies. But in 1814 Great Britain held that by the war of 1812 the United States had forfeited this