

It is a wise adage which bids you, before you get on horseback, know whither you are going to ride, and if the horse happens to be hot and hard-mouthed, the wisdom of the proverb is enhanced. Politicians who are astride upon what they are pleased to call the Liberal principle of Home Rule, will do well to consider at once to what conclusions that steed will carry them. To angle for the Irish vote by advocating the dismemberment of the Mother Country may be a safe and pleasant practice, at least for those who care nothing for the greatness of the race, or for the integrity of its historic centre. But how far does the principle extend? Is any Province of the Dominion to be at liberty, whenever it pleases, to withdraw from Confederation? This is already a practical question in the case of Nova Scotia, and is likely to become a practical question in the case of Quebec, if ever she should cease to be able to draw upon the treasury of the Dominion. That as soon as the Reformers get into power, and virtue reigns instead of vice, Separation will cease—that Nova Scotia will at once become content with Confederation, and Quebec will no longer have any views of her own, is a cheerful but visionary expectation. To pretend that national disintegration is a fundamental and time-honoured principle of the Liberal party surely borders pretty closely on effrontery. The Liberals brought about the unification of Italy. The Liberals brought about the unification of Germany. Republics have shown themselves particularly tenacious of their integrity. To preserve the Union, the American Republic went into the most tremendous of all civil wars. To preserve the Bund, the Swiss Republic, when the Catholic Cantons attempted to secede, coerced them without compunction. If any of our Liberals are Jacobins, or admirers of Jacobins, they will remember "the Republic one and indivisible," and the summary fashion in which its devotees dealt with all who dared to advocate a federal system. Decidedly, if we look to political history, we shall find that centralisation has been the Radical tendency, rather than disruption. The disruption principle, which styles itself Home Rule, is entirely novel, and its origin can be distinctly traced. It came into being when Mr. Gladstone, finding himself in pressing need of the support of "plunderers," men "whose steps were dogged by crime" and "disintegrators of the Empire," declared for an Irish Parliament. From that moment the "principle" was embraced, and inculcated by all whose strategical exigencies happen to be the same as those of its inventor. Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Blaine, and Mr. Blake are all wooing the same mistress, who, in this case, has smiles for them all. Well and good. But there are Liberals like Mr. John Bright, Mr. Chamberlain, and Sir Charles Trevelyan, who, having held the principle of national unity all their lives, refuse to turn round in a moment at the bidding of a party leader or a caucus. Do people suppose that a man with such a record as John Bright is going, for the sake of victory in a faction fight, hypocritically to profess a doctrine, which by breaking up great nations would wreck the most powerful organs of human progress?

COLONEL INGERSOLL, it seems, has been delivering himself of the opinion that a lawyer is a professional strumpet. A professional strumpet undoubtedly that lawyer was, who in defending the perpetrators of the Star Route frauds, though he must have known his clients to be guilty, resorted to solemn protestations of belief in their innocence, and lachrymose appeals to the feelings of the jury. But an advocate who performs his duty by stating the case of his client not only does not prostitute himself, but does nothing that can in any way conflict with the finest sense of honour or endanger in the slightest degree the integrity of his moral character. What do these purists want? Do they wish that when there are two litigants before the bar of justice, the case of one of them should be left unpleaded, or that a man accused of murder should be hanged without being heard by counsel? Under the English system, which separates the functions of the solicitors from those of the advocate, the advocate may be in some danger of having thrust upon him a brief which his professional duty requires him to accept, but which his personal sense of justice would have led him to decline. Even under these circumstances, he is not responsible for the decision to go into court; the keys of public justice are not committed to his hands, and he has only to present fairly any arguments that there may be, in a strictly professional manner, without sophistical tricks or hypocritical protestations. But under our system a case can hardly find its way into court unless the legal firm to which the advocate belongs shall have satisfied itself that there is at least a substantial ground for the contention. To fancy it can ever be the interest of a legal firm to let a case go into court without a leg to stand upon is absurd: the fees for which all lawyers are supposed to crave so ravenously, could never make up for the forfeiture of professional reputation.

THERE is no doubt that the whole of the Socialist, Communist, and Anarchist votes at New York, competed to amount in the aggregate to

18,000 or 20,000, will be thrown for George as mayor. Not that George is deemed up to the Anarchist, or even the Communist mark, but he is with perfect justice regarded in a general way as an apostle of social revolution and public plunder. His supporters will be almost entirely foreigners, and generally foreigners fresh from the naturalisation mill. It does not seem that the progress of opinions having an affinity to those of Mr. George is more rapid among Canadians than it is among native Americans. At least the response to the appeal of one of our Labour contemporaries for subscriptions in aid of the great cause appears up to the present time to be six dollars, the most prominent names among the contributors being those of Mr. A. F. Jury and Mr. William Houston.

AMERICANS declare that they are not going to bear "this fooling with anarchy." There seems reason to fear that the resources of the technicality and quibbling by which American law guards the lives of convicted murderers are not yet entirely exhausted; but if the Chicago Anarchists meet their deserts, the declaration will be made good. England will have to make up her mind on the same point if the Socialists carry out their intention of making a grand demonstration of turbulence on Lord Mayor's day. Authority has of late been relaxed, and disorder has been encouraged to the most fatal extent. Ireland has been allowed to preach by example that people may best obtain what they want by defiance of the law and by outrage. An ex-premier and the leader of a party the other day welcomed with fulsome compliments a deputation from an Irish city which is in open revolt against the Government since it refuses to pay a fine which has been legally imposed on it. The natural consequences of such philanthropy in high places have now to be faced, and they have to be faced unfortunately with a large party in the governing assembly ready to take the side of Mr. Hyndman's mob.

IN a few days the gift of the French to the American people will be unveiled, and a theme of infinite jest afforded to the American humorist. The affair, in fact, offends the practical good sense of the American people; and therefore an undercurrent of levity has always been observable in the main drift of American opinion about it. Congress adjourned without providing for the entertainment of any representative at the inauguration of the nation that made the gift; and the nation that receives it laughs over the goddess, transformed by the comic papers into an indignant wife, with a candle held on high, receiving her belated spouse. The sex of "Liberty" has also, it appears, inspired the woman-suffragist of New York with a determination to assert herself: if liberty be free, woman should be free; and therefore in the coming celebration a prominent place is woman's right. This appears to be the one serious aspect in which this affair is considered: who knows but that the rearing of this statue may be the signal for an awful uprising of the unfranchised sex?

BEFORE long the United States will be in the vortex of another Presidential election. Never was a wiser thing done than the framers of the Confederate constitution did in lengthening the President's term, and forbidding re-election. No commonwealth can bear for ever without injury a moral civil war which rages during two years out of every four. It seems now pretty certain that Mr. Blaine will again receive the Republican nomination, notwithstanding the prejudice against the renomination of a beaten candidate. His chief competitor is Logan, a demagogue of the coarsest and most violent type, who hesitated, it is said, at first between the Federal and the Confederate side, but having embraced the Federal side, became an incarnation of its party passions. The lack of education betrayed in Logan's speeches probably only serves to endear him, as a genuine representative of the masses, to the audience to which he plays. He is said, by his admirers, to be what Mr. Blaine certainly is not—incorruptible; but corruption itself might be practically less noxious than his stolid violence. Mr. Cleveland, according to all appearances, will again be the Democratic candidate, so that we shall have the same battle fought over again. It will be, as it was before, a battle between Reform and Corruption. All the opponents of Reform in the Civil Service and all the sinister interests, including the High Tariff men, will be ranged on the side of Mr. Blaine. His speeches on the Irish Question, and the belief that he will pursue a spirited foreign policy, that is, a policy of insult and menace to England, will probably secure to him on this occasion the entire Irish vote. On the last occasion the Irish vote was pretty equally divided, a part of it, notwithstanding Mr. Blaine's Anti-British attractions, having been still kept by old association in the Democratic ranks. The Mugwumps—as the men who are so misguided as to prefer their country to their party are called—will no doubt adhere to Mr. Cleveland. Nothing has occurred to diminish the objection which on