

England will say that a man more thoroughly kind-hearted and humane, or one more entirely free from prejudice of any kind does not breathe. As has been said before, to call the Crimes Act a Coercion Act is absurd: it coerces no man, nor does it restrain any man from doing anything which it can possibly be deemed a part of rational liberty to do. It simply restrains from the commission or propagation of murder and outrage, of which the victims, it cannot be too often repeated, were Irishmen and Irishwomen. Are murder and outrage privileges of which Ireland is wronged by being deprived? Advocates of Separation themselves plead that the Irish character being different from the English requires different institutions, and, as some of them frankly avow, a more arbitrary form of government. What wrong then is done, if the mode of administering the criminal law is adapted to the special exigencies of Ireland? Is trial by common jury a real blessing when, owing to local terrorism, it totally breaks down? What is the Crimes Act compared with the measures which every other European Government adopts for the repression of disorder in disturbed districts without provoking any indignant comments from those who lift up their eyes and hands in indignation because the British Parliament interposes in the mildest way to arrest the course of an agrarian reign of terror? What is it compared with the state of siege? No doubt, the less of exceptional legislation there is for Ireland, and the more that island is treated as an integral part of the United Kingdom, the better. Perhaps, if the winter should bring fresh proof that the ordinary law will not suffice, it may be thought expedient to pass a law, extending to all the three kingdoms, for the repression of dynamiters, moonlighters and the incendiaries who incite to public plunder, murder and civil war.

It is assumed that with the advent to power of a Tory Government British honour breathes again, and Englishmen are released from the fear of being insulted with impunity by foreign nations. It is true that the party of reaction is given to cultivating the military spirit, and regards quarrels abroad as the best antidotes to reform at home. It is true also that in the party of progress there is now included a large manufacturing element, to which war brings closed markets as well as increased taxation, and which inclines to peace. It is natural moreover that those who pay and bleed should be less fond of war than those who only read of battles in the newspaper at their clubs. But the ultra-pacific tendencies of Manchester are the offspring of its trade, not of its political progressiveness; and if they have a taint of self-interest, the same may be said of those of the Tory squire who, while he shouts for the honour of the country, knows that war will bring practical protection to agriculture and enhanced rents. To the assumption that a spirited foreign policy and a quick sense of national honour have been the appanage of the reactionary party, history demurs. It might be pedantic to go back to the times of York and Lancaster; but we shall find that even then the party which was on the whole identical with that of liberalism was also in favour of sustaining the national honour on Continental fields, and opposed to the Gallicizing as well as the absolutist policy of Margaret of Anjou. No one will doubt that the adventurers who under Elizabeth raised England to the summit of glory, and overthrew the master of the Armada, belonged as a group to Protestantism and progress. Cromwell and the Commonwealth placed England at the head of Europe; the founders of the Tory Party under the Restoration placed her at the feet of France. Again, the struggle for the liberties of Europe against Louis XIV. was carried on by the Whigs, and its fruits were ignominiously bartered by the Tories under Bolingbroke at Utrecht. The fruits of Chatham's victories were not less ignominiously betrayed by the Tories under Bute. Of the American War and its trophies the credit belongs entirely to the Tories, who may also claim the honour of the war against the French Republic, and of the victories of the Duke of York. When the French War became a struggle against the piratical tyranny of Napoleon it became national, only a small remnant of malcontent Whigs standing aloof. As soon as Canning became a Liberal his foreign policy was spirited enough, and if the subsequent leaders of the Liberal Party, Russell and Palmerston, were censurable on any ground it certainly was not on that of deficient love of intervention. But the martial spirit of Toryism was the other day brought to a homely yet decisive test. None are more ardent Tories than the spirit-dealers: yet when they were called upon to submit to a moderate increase of taxation, for the purpose of putting the country on a footing of defence against Russia, they rose in a fury and leagued themselves with Irish Disunionists for the overthrow of the Government.

In England accession to office has produced its natural effects on the Opposition of yesterday. The agreement with Russia instead of being denounced as an ignominious surrender, has been quietly accepted. The evacuation of the Soudan has been allowed to proceed, and hints have been

thrown out of a disposition to retire from Egypt. Lord Randolph Churchill has spoken like a gentleman, even to Mr. Gladstone. The Protectionists and Free Traders have been gracefully dismissed with a Commission of Inquiry into the condition of trade, of which Lord Iddesleigh, a strong Free Trader, is to be the chairman. The Conservative treaty of Kilmaham, meantime, is being carried into effect, and the new Lord-Lieutenant is reducing the police force on the rather precarious assumption that Ireland being quiet with safeguards will be equally quiet without them. It is not likely, however, that Mr. Parnell will for the present permit anything to be done which may demonstrate the imprudence of abandoning the Crimes Act. In this line the Conservatives are kept up to the mark by the counter-bidding of their opponents. Lord Lorne, who, according to the last report, is to run for a constituency including a large number of Irish voters that Mr. Parnell ought to be in the Cabinet; and the utterance is not less wise than some which we have heard before. Of the prospects of the Tory Government in November it is impossible at present to form an estimate. Bye-elections under the existing franchise mean little or nothing. Woodstock is a pocket borough of the Lord of Blenheim, and Eye is one of the small boroughs doomed to extinction by the Franchise Act. It is probable that the existing constituencies are not very grateful to the party by which their privileges have been abolished. A similar feeling may in some cases have been at the root of Whig and Liberal disaffection in the House of Commons. The latest advices, by the details which they give of the negotiations prior to the change of Ministry, make more manifest than ever the personal ardour with which the Court threw itself into the struggle on the side of Lord Salisbury, and whatever help is possible from that quarter the Tory Government will receive. Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Charles Dilke also continue to do their part in sending over recruits to the Conservative ranks. In the meantime there are, we are persuaded, masses of good citizens who only wish to see the country saved from the selfishness of both factions. There is an opening, if ever there was one in English politics, for a man; but the man, as usual, is not forthcoming.

PULPIT orators, like platform orators, live in an atmosphere of rhetorical excitement and exaggeration which, whatever may be its relations to the spiritual and transcendental, is not the most favourable to soundness of moral judgment upon practical questions. Of this we cannot help thinking that Mr. Spurgeon's approval of the conduct of the *Pall Mall Gazette* in serving up for the public a banquet of nastiness is an instance. Can any man in his senses imagine that morality gains by having the most polluting of all filth scattered over the country by tons, the street in which it is sold, blocked by crowds thirsting for obscene scandal, and boys crying the abomination through all the streets? Can any one in his senses fail to see the injury done to the community by scattering broadcast hideous suspicions and to individuals by pointing to them without naming them, and thus compelling them either to rest for ever under the shadow of an infamous charge or, by recognizing the allusion and stepping forward, to appear as accusers of themselves? Can any one in his senses doubt what is the motive of the editor of a notoriously sensation-mongering journal for entering into such investigations and publishing their results with screaming advertisements, instead of bringing the facts at once to the knowledge of the proper authorities and under the cognizance of justice? If such modes of pushing the circulation of a journal were to be sanctioned, there would be a continual reign of social terror; for we all inherit the frailties of humanity, and hardly a man exists who, if the familiars of some editorial inquisition were set as spies upon his daily life, might not have his peace destroyed. Vile espionage carried on by detectives as vile, would be as great an evil as sensual license. A more trustworthy organ of sound morality could hardly be found than the Athenæum Club, the members of which are not sybarites, but men of letters or science, professional men or men in public life; and the Athenæum Club, as the Cable informs us, has ordered the *Pall Mall Gazette* to be excluded from its reading-room and taken off its files. This judgment is worth a good deal more than that of any popular preacher who has declaimed himself out of ordinary morality and common sense. How did Mr. Spurgeon come by his knowledge of these horrible practices, and what means has he had of verifying any scandalous gossip that may have reached his ears? These are questions to be answered before we believe on his authority that a great Christian city is a Gomorrah. The sensational Pulpit seems likely to become almost as great a social nuisance as the sensational Press, and perhaps the moral difference between the motives of the preacher and those of the journalist is not so great as we should like to believe. The thanks of this community are due to the *Mail* and *Globe* for resisting commercial temptation and refusing to pollute our households and the imaginations of our people with this moral ordure for the reproduction of which in Canada there is absolutely no excuse.