

and physical interests it is of more importance to the national welfare that the transmissible qualities of the race should not be vitiated in those classes than in their social superiors. Germany, according to the British Consul-General, is going hard and fast to work to poison the stock at its root." Here indeed, is a pretty state of affairs narrated concerning the enlightened Kingdom of Prussia, and, what is also very grave, a still worse condition of things is said to obtain in the equally respectable kingdoms of Sweden and Denmark, for are they not all of them countries of the Reformation, and basking in the Lutheran light? The *Times* goes on to propose reasons for the excessive drinking—Such as the want of rational amusement—the absence of temperance societies—of which more anon—the want of proper food, etc., concluding as follows:—"The claim made is that uneducated minds are incapable of amusing themselves without artificial and mechanical assistance, that the existence of the masses of mankind in Europe is so sad and dull and starved, morally, mentally, and materially, as to be unable to proceed without intervals of virtual negation."—But it used to be affirmed that there were no uneducated minds in Prussia.—The education, in fact, of the Prussian troops, and those of Germany generally—was urged as a reason for the success of the German arms in the war with France—and if there was no superiority of the kind, how did a drunken nation conquer a sober one—for no one accuses France of drunkenness? Or is there no hope of truly educated minds or of sobriety in the best education that it is possible to confer upon the masses, and such as it is generally understood the German masses have long been given? But as to that reason put forward by the *Times* touching the want of temperance societies, such societies with lecturers, the Goughs and Boothes, and others, are numerous in the United States, and yet drunkenness there, with all its frightful consequences, is still on the increase.—The following statistics are borrowed by us from our contemporary the *San Francisco Monitor*:—"The reports of the United States Commissioner of the Revenue show a continual increase. For example, according to the latest, that for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1884, the total revenue from distilled spirits amounted to 76,905,385,26, dols. an increase over 1883 of 253,661,006, dols. From fermented liquors the receipts for 1884 were 18,084,954,11, dols., an increase over 1883 of 1,184,338,30. The total production of distilled spirits the last fiscal year was 75,435,739 gallons, an increase over the production of 1883 of 1,422,431 gallons. The total production of fermented liquors for the fiscal year of 1884 was 18,998,619 barrels, an increase over 1883 of 1,240,727 barrels. The number of distilleries operated during 1884 was 4,738; the number of brewers, 2,240." Meantime Irish drunkenness falls quite into the back-ground, and while all these highly respectable, progressive, and prosperous people are drinking away like fish, mendacity only can accuse Irish distress of arising from a like habit.

What they are to do with Ireland short of granting the independence that her people demand seems PUZZLED. now to be the puzzle of all political parties in

Great Britain.—Representative Conservatives are coming forward to denounce Dublin Castle as the remaining stronghold of Whig ascendancy, now that the Church Establishment which was the other stronghold has been removed, and they point to the curious inconsistency between the manner in which the conquests of King William III have been regarded in England and Ireland respectively,—in the one country being looked upon as the triumph of the Whigs, and in the other as that of the Tories. Mr. Howorth a representative Conservative who writes to the *Times* giving such a view of the matter, in a letter that is made the subject of a leader, denounces the Castle as appearing to the outside world to be a "nest of sinecurists out of sympathy with the Irish people, and most unlikely to make Ireland either happier or more united," and he adds, "Let it go and let its name be forgotten." The *Times* points out, however, that the abolition of the Castle is not a new idea, but that a bill for such an object was brought into Parliament by Lord John Russell in 1850, —and he agrees with Lord John that the Lord Lieutenant occupies a most anomalous position.—"The main argument," he continues, "against the change is that used by the Duke of Wellington, in a debate which took place in the same session in the House of Lords. He strongly opposed the abolition of the Viceroyalty, on the ground that, Ireland being frequently the scene of important military operations, it was necessary for the military authorities to be able to confer with a civil authority of great dignity and unimpeachable loyalty. He could not, he said, as Commander-in-Chief, be expected to confer with such a man as Mr. O'Connell, if he happened to be Lord Mayor of Dublin."—The impossibility, nevertheless, that the Commander-in-Chief should confer with such a man as Mr. O'Connell, since the Duke of Wellington's time, is looked upon as less complete.—But with the abolition of the Castle and the establishment of a proper system of Government, the necessity for the carrying on of important military operations of the kind alluded to, and at variance with the mind of the chief magistrate of the metropolis, would be obviated and all the difficulty removed. The *Times*, however, does not contemplate a change of this satisfactory nature

but would have the executive power taken from the Castle exercised by a responsible Minister of State who would fulfil all the requirements demanded even by a second Duke of Wellington, should such a one arise. The *Times*, moreover, sufficiently explains the changes that he for his part would sanction in this matter by a defence of the Irish permanent officials whom he tells us—are "Irish in birth and Irish in feeling" it—being the especial curse of every oppressed nation to see certain of its own members placed in the seat of the renegade and fulfilling all its duties with ardour—who, for example so warm in the service of Russia as Colonel Alikhanoff the Georgian? But the *Times* adds that whatever the new authority may be, it will probably be found that the same staff of permanent officials, that is of sinecurists out of sympathy with the people—as Mr. Howorth says—is employed by it. Mr. Howorth, meantime, errs in considering these officials as sinecurists, they have their duties to perform, and, however various their offices in name, their duties are one, that is to press upon the Lord Lieutenant and the Chief Secretary, as the *Saturday Review* informed us the other day, the necessity for misgoverning the country. To retain these men in office would be to counteract every benefit to be expected from any change that may take place, and to root them out finally, is one of the chief objects of the national party. The *Times*, we need hardly say opposes the notion of any change approaching to the re-establishment of a national Parliament, but the weakness of his arguments against it is a most hopeful feature in the case. We may say in passing that they remind us of that imbecile plea advanced among ourselves against a government grant to the Catholic schools, to the effect that if such were made, every other denomination would expect as much. "If Ireland obtained such a Council," he says, alluding to a Central Council equivalent almost to a Parliament, "Scotland and Wales would set up a claim for similar institutions, and the Imperial Parliament would thus be disintegrated in structure and weakened in its personal composition. England would certainly be entitled to institutions similar to those which Ireland, Scotland, and Wales had obtained, and it is more than doubtful whether either country contains political material of good quality and quantity sufficient to supply Parliament as well as the contemplated Local Councils" But Scotland, Wales, and England would hardly claim such councils if they did not stand in need of them—and if they do, is not their need worthy of consideration? To withhold from these countries their needs in order to spare men of sufficient parts to the Imperial Parliament would be an unjust action, and the argument, moreover, discredits the abilities of the men of the countries in question. Surely the exceptional able man is not always chosen to represent some constituency. The *Times*, however, admits that the question must be settled, and thus all his arguments in favour of Dublin Castle, or an equivalent institution, go for nothing, and we perceive that he also has been driven by the successful Irish party to the certainty that Ireland must in future be fairly and differently treated—however puzzled he may be in common with others as to what is to be done in the way of avoiding the inevitable, that is the full concession of national independence, which is demanded and which alone will satisfy the nation. He concludes as follows:—"This, however, is a question which can hardly be determined offhand, and it is only necessary at present to indicate some of its inherent difficulties. The new House of Commons will have to grapple with these difficulties whatever Government is in power. It is not amiss therefore, that both parties should now be preparing to approach the problem of the future government of Ireland with something like a common purpose and common principles of action."

BETTER THAN WORSE.

It is not only Cardinal Manning, however, who is looking forward towards the effect to be produced on the religion of England by the extended franchise when it has been put into practice. Cardinal Manning hopes that the effect may be for the good of the country, and the support of Christianity—but a certain body of men are alarmed lest a different result may follow. We allude to the members of the Established Church, who feel some apprehension lest the efforts that will certainly be made to influence the new voters against the Establishment may prove successful, and a majority pledged to its destruction, be returned to Parliament. But touching the downfall of the Church of England, it is a matter that deserves the consideration of others besides the members of that Church as to whether it would not in fact prove a misfortune, and tend to hasten the decay of religion. We need hardly say that our sympathy for the Church of England as a religious system is very little. In some respects indeed, we consider it the most faulty of all the Protestant Sects, but, on the other hand, it has qualities that in some degree redeem it from these faults, and entitle it to the highest esteem that any Catholic can bestow upon a system of religion that he recognises as false. It undoubtedly occupies a position in England, that, were it lost, would be almost certainly taken up by very much inferior agencies, and it provides for a steady, and comparatively moderate teaching of Christian truths, that, failing its means, would either cease to be taught, or would become the subject of a teaching possibly grotesque and outrageous, and certainly exaggerated and