

the trumpet for a war of personalities was sounded. At once there is a joyous response to the call. Investigations have been promptly commenced into the amours and supper parties of Mr. Cleveland's youth, and as, in the case of a man whose future prominence nobody can foresee, accurate registers are seldom kept of such events, an almost unbounded field of stimulating and luscious controversy is opened. The several charges of drunkenness, seduction, abduction and cruelty form so many distinct issues upon each of which newspaper dissertations equal in their collective bulk to the works of the most voluminous authors are sure to be written between this and November. It would be curious to compute how many yards of disputation were produced on the question whether General Garfield, in the period of his life when he was struggling with penury, had been guilty of leaving a tailor's bill unpaid. The attempt to blast Mr. Tilden's character and bring on him a heavy loss by ransacking his returns under the income tax was dirtier still. Ambition must indeed be a master passion when it can induce a man to go through such an ordeal for the sake of a four-years' tenure of doubtful power, amidst all the swarm of annoyances which beset life in the White House and with no prospect, when his term is over, but total eclipse. The winds of party fury are now fairly let loose; for the next three months the storm will rage, patriotism will be lost in faction, commerce as well as politics will feel the baneful effect, and in case of a disputable result, which, with so much sectionalism and bolting it is at least possible, a crisis of dangerous violence may once more ensue. Compared with these evils, and with the traces inevitably left on the political character of the nation, the expense of the contest is, to people who are so rich, a small matter; yet, in itself, it is not small. Experienced politicians say that two millions at least will be spent in the State of New York alone. What is still worse is, that not a little of this money is raised virtually by pledging in advance the patronage of the State. It cannot be too often repeated, in justice to the framers of the Constitution, that nothing of this kind was intended by them. Their intention was that the President should be quietly selected by a board of presidential electors. Had they only adhered to the decision to which at one time they came, that the President should be elected by the Legislature, all might have been well. Thought begins, as well it may, to be stirred in the United States on this subject. Mr. Henry C. Lockwood's treatise on The Abolition of the Presidency comes in season and is not unlikely to open a serious discussion. To him, the monarchic tendencies of an institution, which he justly regards as a mistaken and needless reproduction of British royalty, are the chief objects of apprehension; but the consequences which attend the mode of election, as now presented to our eyes, afford surely as great a subject for misgiving. Who can doubt that the paroxysm brought on by the Presidential Election of 1861 precipitated, if it did not produce, the Civil War? It is true that a general election in Canada or in England, when possession of the Government depends on the result, is the counterpart of the Presidential election in the United States. But neither practice is in any way essential to elective government or destined to prevail for ever.

In England the agitation against the Lords goes on and continues to illustrate the peculiarity of a Constitution under which, to get a measure passed by the legislature, you descend into the street. The Polish Constitution, under which they all met armed, and everybody had a veto was still rougher and more primæval, but there is an affinity between the two. Both are contrasted with constitutions adapted to modern times, in which all powers are properly defined and are exercised in accordance with the law. All say that the Lords will succumb. Succumb they certainly will in the end and on the main question between them and the people. Heredity is dead at the root; that one house of the legislature should remain the property of a group of privileged families in an age of reason is impossible. Moreover, the peerage rests substantially on great estates which are held together by primogeniture and entail; and, even if agrarian change goes no further, primogeniture and entail are assuredly doomed. But in this present battle about the Franchise Bill, the position of the Lords is perhaps not so hopelessly weak as it is assumed to be. Street parades in themselves are harmless. Violence the Government itself must repress, and if the Prime Minister is persuaded to take the stump in person, he may have as chief of the Executive to put down disturbance which his own eloquence has excited. Nor is the populace all on one side; in some of the cities it is largely Tory; while any popular agitation is sure to produce a certain amount of reaction among the property-holding and Conservative classes. Popular enthusiasm cools unless its temperature is sustained by the sense of some crying injustice; and there are not now, as in 1830, a mountain of abuses to be removed, and great practical objects to be attained. Mr. Gladstone is seventy-four: the cohesion of his party

depends on his presence at its head; events come thick, and the Ides of November, though in the calendar near, are politically some way off. In itself the contention of the Lords is right: they are entitled to demand that Extension and Redistribution shall be laid before them together, in order that the probable effect of the whole measure on the Constitution may be seen; and their case in this respect is strengthened by Mr. Gladstone's avowal that his object in sending forward Extension by itself is to commit the Lords in advance, and put them under a moral necessity of accepting his plan of Redistribution whatever it may turn out to be. Liberals of the more thoughtful class might not repine at a postponement of the Franchise Bill if the result were likely to be a broader and more statesmanlike treatment of the entire question. The long revolution by which supreme power has been transferred from the Crown and the aristocracy to the people, touches its close, and the time has come for finally organizing government on the elective basis, with Conservative safeguards of a rational and effective kind in place of the moribund and discredited relics of the feudal era. To make the Lower House more democratic, by an extension of the Franchise, without any corresponding alteration of the Upper House is to aggravate the antagonism between the two, and to increase the peril of collisions in the future. These things some Liberals in England see, but the Prime Minister does not; he talks about "uniting the people by his Franchise Bill round the ancient throne," as if the ancient throne were still the real government, and the House of Commons, instead of being the real government as it is, were still merely a representation of the people. Great was the genius of Chatham, great was the genius of his son; but both had their limits. Chatham could not have framed a budget and his son was the worst of war ministers. Great, almost miraculous in some respects are the powers of Mr. Gladstone; and splendid have been the services which he has rendered to his country. Yet Ireland is in a state of smothered rebellion, the Union is in danger, the Egyptian question is in confusion, the attempt to reorganize the House of Commons by the new rules has failed, and the eloquence which commends the Franchise Bill, may not be accompanied by an equal measure of the forecast which distinctly anticipates its practical operation.

In addressing the people of this continent Mr. George and his associates show a decided disposition to lower their tone. It is one thing to bully the weak and decried landowners of England or Ireland: it is another thing to tell all the farmers of this continent that their freeholds are not their own, but public property stolen by them from the nation, which the community would be justified in resuming without paying them any compensation. Moreover, in an old country where titles run back into the mist of time, it is possible to make those who are ignorant of economical history believe that all private proprietorship had its origin in fraud; whereas here everybody knows that the land was honestly acquired by purchase from that very State which, with the price in its pocket, is instigated to plunder the purchaser. The scheme of confiscation which the Radical *Pall Mall Gazette* compared to stealing spoons, and the Radical Mr. Harrison to Californian mail robbing, is now softened down to a peculiar, a very peculiar, system of taxation. More than this, there is a complete change of the issue. We are told that Mr. George's contention is simply "he that doth not work, neither shall he eat." That saying is found in the New Testament together, it may be observed, with some others which would hardly suit the purposes of the preachers of social war. Therefore every true Christian, though he may have the means of eating without work, will work to the best of his ability; nor will he have much difficulty in finding things which the community needs to have done and which in our present state only a man of independent means can do. But so far as the saying is applicable to the present question at all, it is applicable not only to the idle holder of property in land, but to the idle holder of property of any kind; nay, to the holder, however industrious, of any property which he has inherited and not made. We shall have to confiscate everybody's patrimony, whether it be in land or stock, and to prohibit any man for the future from leaving anything to his children; the result of which would be that a great incentive to industrial effort would be lost, and that saving would altogether cease. Mr. George's principles threaten all property alike, including the plant of the newspaper which seeks by coquetting with his theories to win for its party the votes of the artisans. The thrifty artisan himself owns, or hopes to own, the lot on which his house is built, and that lot is just as much menaced with nationalization as the estates of the Duke of Argyle.

A LIVELY controversy has been going on about Religion in the English Reviews between the Agnostic, Mr. Herbert Spencer, the Positivist, Mr. Harrison, and Sir Fitzjames Stephen, who, perhaps, would be best