

men occasionally change their opinions, and it is not fair to infer, unless the evidence on the point is unquestionable, that in presenting a change of front they are simply trimming their sails to catch the popular breeze. Comparative characters were introduced to show the inferiority of Mr. Gladstone's statesmanship—Bright and Beaconsfield.

To our view John Bright could not, as a statesman, be appropriately compared to Mr. Gladstone, the latter being in almost every direction his superior. Gladstone is a natural leader of men. This is an essential qualification. Without it the statesman is hampered in carrying his measures forward to success, not having the necessary assistance. Mr. Bright was great as a political standard bearer, not as a leader in detail at close quarters. He was well nigh invincible on the platform. While not as logical as Gladstone, he was more powerful with the people as a speaker. Beyond this he did not hold a high place in the field of statesmanship. His power was displayed in the championship of a measure or movement, not in originating either.

The statesmanship of Beaconsfield differed from that of Gladstone as widely as the characteristics of the two men. While the home policy of the latter, as premier, has always been regarded as vigorous and progressive, that in connection with foreign affairs has been considered weak. Under his administration England has taken a comparatively rear seat among the great powers, and has not infrequently submitted to undignified snubbing.

Beaconsfield, on the other hand, was noted for his "spirited foreign policy," and would only consent to "peace with honor," never being willing to sacrifice the latter for the former. An illustration of this feature was given during the last Russo-Turkish war, when the troops of the Czar approached uncomfortably near to Constantinople, thus endangering England's eastern interests. Instantly Beaconsfield's government ordered a British fleet to pass up the Dardanelles into the Black Sea. This meant war if the Russians advanced a step further toward the capital of Turkey. The Czar weakened and the crisis was bridged.

Had Gladstone been premier, it is probable that the Russians would have taken possession of Constantinople and contiguous country, and

one of the bloodiest struggles of history been precipitated.

The same spirited foreign policy enabled Beaconsfield to practically dictate to the Berlin Conference which grew out of the struggle between Russia and Turkey, the famous treaty of Berlin being mostly the work of his subtle mind.

Gladstone's tendency is toward Republicanism, whose success means the disintegration of the British Empire. Beaconsfield was essentially an imperialist, and his entire effort was in the direction of the extension of the empire and preserving it intact. The genius of the statesmanship of Gladstone naturally appeals to the sympathy of the lovers of popular rule, in the direction of which the great commoner has always traveled during the larger and later period of his notable career. Loyal Englishmen who regard the disruption of the British Empire with repugnance, necessarily look toward Beaconsfield as the greater man of the two. Both are great, but, remarkable as it may appear, in opposite directions, and it seems to be difficult to decide as to who is entitled to occupy the first place. There is but little doubt as to who would receive the popular verdict in this and his own country. It would be the "Grand Old Man," who is one of the most remarkable characters of modern times in many respects. His capacity for acquiring and retaining information, his working power and physical vitality are all phenomenal with him.

As a far-seeing operator of a vigorous foreign policy and a polished, brilliant and incisive debater, Beaconsfield—Gladstone's conspicuous antagonist—was an intellectual marvel.

Bright could not be consistently compared to either of those particularly shining lights.

"LIBERAL" LOVE FOR THE LABORER.

How do the workingmen of this city like the "Liberal" plot to rob them of their votes? It is hoped by the "Liberals" that many working men will be unable to appear at the time set to hear objections and thus an excuse will be open to strike their names from the lists. So they are served with objections simply to put them to annoyance and expense if they respond. This is "Liberal" love for the labor element. Every decent man, no matter what may be his political complexion, ought to

show his contempt for this mean and characteristically "Liberal" dodge by turning his back on a party and candidates who seek to gain power and place by such cowardly subterfuges. Striking the names of well known citizens from the lists, piling on names without residences so as to leave loopholes for fraud, making out bogus objections to qualified voters and citing them to appear when it will be most inconvenient, are the means by which the "Liberal" managers and candidates hope to gain the county election. If the workingmen of this city will only unite to show their detestation of these cowardly methods, they will smite "Liberal" trickery a blow from which it will never recover.

MANIFEST INJUSTICE.

THE decision rendered by the Supreme Court of Utah in regard to the inheritance by illegitimate children of the estates of deceased parents is worth reading. It serves to show on what shallow grounds judges can exercise manifest injustice when prejudice colors a case and intolerance warps the judgment. The dissenting opinion of Judge Blackburn should also be read critically and comparison be made with the reasoning of the decision.

We hope the appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States which is contemplated will be perfected, and that the record is such that the entire case can be opened. The highest court, representing the whole nation, should be brought to speak and show whether the United States will sanction the wrong done to the innocent by the decision of the courts of Utah.

THE REVOLUTION ENDED.

THE Buenos Ayres revolution has collapsed. So says a dispatch received July 29, signed by the minister of finance, who had been held a prisoner by the insurgents. The government troops have quelled the insurrection and peace has been re-established. This news was doubtless unexpected, as according to former accounts, the revolutionists were carrying everything before them.

It seems that the trouble was largely confined to the City of Buenos Ayres, and its cause is not clear. It has been asserted that the discontent arose from a popular aversion to the financial policy of President Cillmau