

THE *Daily News* story of the blind man whose face "beamed with delight" at touching the hem of Mr. Gladstone's garment is outdone by the blasphemous and indecent declaration of Lord Wolverton, that Mr. Chamberlain is worse than Judas Iscariot in that he betrayed not his master but his Maker. The idea of comparing the Prime Minister to the Founder of Christianity is, however, a favourite one with the Gladstonites.

THE Vienna *Neue Freie Presse* tells a story that it thinks affords an explanation of the death of the late King of Bavaria. A few weeks before the King's death, Julius der Grosse, the German author, sent his Majesty a novel he had published in which the life of the Austrian historian Count Johann Majlath was described. That nobleman ended his existence by throwing himself, with his daughter, into Lake Starnberg at almost the identical spot where the body of King Louis was found.

THE papers have been all relating the troubles of a good man, Mr. Green, of Bishopswood House, Highgate, with 2,500 bottles of port in his cellar, valued at £600, and who finally, and after considering the three courses open to him, as to all men, poured the wine into the sewers. We, says the *Lancet*, must all admire the motive that impelled to this action. But the action itself is not clearly entitled to admiration. The wine should have been given to hospitals. It is allowed to be of use as medicine, and the course must be considered open to the charge of waste. The question in casuistry is not entirely new. A well-known physician is understood to be somewhat perplexed with it. There are instances where the offending alcohol is best thrown into the sewers and that promptly; but the present is not one of these.

PERHAPS it is hardly fair to hold Mr. Gladstone's Ministry of Clerks accountable for former utterances on Irish affairs: the great man having changed his mind, these have found no difficulty—for they have not much to deal with—in changing theirs too, and seeing black to be white. But still it is amusing to note the different construction put upon the word "coercion" when used by Lord Salisbury to what it bore when the thing was practised by Mr. Gladstone. In a letter addressed, January 26, 1881, by the present President of the Board of Trade, Mr. Mundella, at that time Vice-President of the Council, the writer says:—"With respect to your remarks about coercion in Ireland, I must remind you that the question is, whether the law shall prevail or the tyranny of an irresponsible tribunal. I am quite clear that the Government is only discharging its first duty to Ireland in restoring law and order in that unhappy country." Why does it not persist in discharging its first duty, instead of abdicating in favour of the "irresponsible tribunal."

OUR good friend the *Christian Guardian* is angry at THE WEEK apparently because, being an independent journal of criticism, it does not exclude from its columns the views of correspondents who differ from the *Guardian* and other similar organs of public opinion, claiming to exercise a sort of irregular papal control over the consciences of men with respect to the Prohibition question. We regret very much to fall under the displeasure of our contemporary; but we respectfully submit that to take to scolding is hardly worthy of the name it bears. THE WEEK puts on no "airs of lofty superiority," nor "assumptions of wisdom," and certainly its columns have always shown it tries to give "what people want, facts and arguments—not offensive epithets and baseless assumptions." We are afraid, however, that the *Guardian* is too angry to remember this, or to perceive its own manifest unfairness in abusing THE WEEK for opinions or sentiments expressed in correspondence which it is bound as an independent journal to find place for, but for whose contents it has not indicated the slightest approval.

A CORRESPONDENT of the *Statist* suggests that owing to the continued depression and high prices of first-class stocks, men's minds are directed naturally to the difficulties of investment, and to the working of the laws which govern undertakings with limited liability; that where liability is limited, a company should be restricted to the amount of its actual capital in its business transactions, otherwise its competition is unfair. He thinks there is a manifest want of controlling power, which can only be supplied by the wholesome check upon rash speculation engendered in private traders by fear of bankruptcy. But while arguing for restricting business in one direction, its extension is advocated in another, namely, in permitting limited partnerships, or rather limited partners in unlimited concerns. This, it is said, could easily be managed by enacting that every partner whose name appeared in the "style" of the copartnership would be deemed

the "firm," and responsible for all he possessed, while those partners who appear as "Co." may be responsible merely to the amount of capital which they have each contributed to the business.

IN a recent work on the "Friendly Society Movement" by the Rev. J. F. Wilkinson, the author says:—The Friendly Society discipline exercised upon the working man has made him, in large towns, the most attentive and orderly element present at a public meeting. . . . Thousands of artisans and workmen, now in positions of confidence and good remuneration, date the turning point in their lives from the time when they first joined an affiliated order. The training received in the lodge-room is brought to bear outside, and a member's own affairs are, consciously or unconsciously, benefited thereby. The mind is expanded, the range of thought broadened by the common platform upon which every member meets, neither religious nor political discussions being allowed to disturb the ritual and business; the social barriers which sunder class from class are broken down, and each individual member has equal rights and privileges; office is open to all who show themselves capable of being advanced by order of merit, and who have raised themselves—whatever their station in life may be—in the eyes of their fellow members.

THE relations between Russia and Bulgaria are said to be becoming more "strained" than ever. The semi-official Russian Press declares that Prince Alexander "presumes to disregard the decisions of Europe," and the non-official Press suggests that he ought to be hanged; while the Russian Government presses the Sultan by every kind of menace, including a demand for an indemnity in arrears, to interfere in Sofia. A formal Note has even been presented to the Porte complaining that Prince Alexander has violated the Organic Statute of Eastern Roumelia, and that the two Bulgarias are becoming one, in spite of the decision of Conference. The Sultan is indisposed to interfere, but has circulated a despatch announcing that he has recommended moderation to the Prince. The Prince himself has openly informed a deputation which besought him to reconcile himself with Russia, that he does not know what Russia wants; that he has repeatedly made overtures; that he has not received even a message from St. Petersburg since September; and that his last overture was answered by a decree depriving him of his rank in the Russian Army. The Czar is evidently full of hatred; but the Prince goes on quietly drilling his soldiers and collecting arms. Russia can hardly move till the European situation alters.

WE are afraid, says the *Spectator*, that when great orators like Mr. Gladstone tell us to govern Ireland not by force, but by love, we shall throw all considerations bearing on the true interest of Ireland and the true duty of England to the winds, and leave the very core of the justice of the matter unexamined and undiscriminated. We are afraid of handing over Ireland, in the false name of love, to a party whose instrument has been terror and whose heart has been full of injustice for a long period of years; to a party that has compelled honourable debtors to go by night to pay their debts, and to conceal from all the world that they have paid them; to a party that has invented the cruellest of social excommunications for its own political purposes; to a party that, when it found Mr. Gladstone himself endeavouring to do justice to its native country, exerted itself to the utmost to foil his noble efforts; to a party whose most solemn words uttered one month have been broken with a light laugh the next; to a party that, though it has combined the worst moral influence on Ireland which the present century has seen, with the most cynical indifference to the good of this country, Mr. Gladstone now champions as that which should have on its side every heart which beats for the cause of the oppressed.

IN an article on "Natural Laws and the Home Rule Problem" in the July *Fortnightly Review*, Mr. Frank Harris writes:—During the recent debates in the House of Commons, Mr. Gladstone tried his best to furnish historical parallels to the connexion between Ireland and Great Britain; he even went so far as to taunt his adversaries with their inability to produce from history one single instance where relaxing the tie between countries had never had evil consequences, and to boast of the many instances to the contrary which he had adduced. But in all the instances he enumerated, one condition of primary importance was left out of the account. He never took the difference of language into consideration; he spoke of Austro-Hungary, as if Austrian and Hungarian both spoke the same tongue, and looked back upon the same history. I challenge Mr. Gladstone to adduce one instance in which a race, after having abandoned its own language, after having thus consented to merge its intellectual