

SCOTTISH POLITICS.

BY THE RIGHT HON. THE MARQUIS OF LORNE.

NOT very long ago the late Duke of Buccleuch saw a claymore in the shop of a Paris dealer in arms, and, entering, examined the weapon, asked the price, and purchased it. With the Italian "basket" hilt, and straight blade with double groove running nearly to the point, this was the sword adopted by the Highlanders, and purchased by them in considerable numbers, while at home they also manufactured them. The "Andrea Ferrara" blade which had caught the Duke's eye was a fine specimen of the old master's workmanship. But there was a special reason which led the purchaser to buy it at sight. Engraved on its steel was the name of "Strathalan," and the motto "Scotland for Ever. No Union." It had belonged to the nobleman whose title it bore, and whose hand had grown stiff in death while it gripped its hilt on "Drummossie fatal muir," the battlefield of Culloden. Whether taken by the victorious Hanoverian troops, or brought away from the scene of carnage by some faithful clansman before the last charge of the Highlanders had failed before the fire of the grenadiers and of the Campbells who had enfiladed the Jacobites' position from the shelter of a neighboring park wall, will never be accurately known. But Strathalan's sword was returned to the head of the family by the Duke.

That family, in the generation succeeding to that which had perished in the Civil War fighting for "No Union," saw its members conducting one of the richest private banks in the great metropolis of London, a capital with which their fathers had wished to have as little communion, and as little knowledge of it, as possible. The sons had more English gold in their coffers than there were drops of blood in the bodies of the Clan Drummond who bled at Culloden. The fathers had loved their Stuart king and Catholic faith not wisely but too well. The next generation found that the fathers' political sins are not always visited upon the children,

and Drummond Bank, in Charing Cross, stands to-day a curious and instructive commentary on that cry of old Scottish patriotism, "Scotland for Ever. No Union."

Monarchs may look with a natural approval on that fidelity to the sacred right of hereditary sovereignty which led the Jacobite to fight and lose life and fortune to uphold the succession to the crown of the last of the men of the Stuart royal race. The "Wee German Lairdie," the Hanoverian ruler, was only descended from a daughter of that old Scottish house, and the Revolution of 1688 had taught men in Britain to look to the bent of their kings' characters quite as much as to their blood. Descent might be of value in gaining the votes of those who laid store on such matters, but decency in regarding the liberties of the subject was of far more value, and had come to determine the tenure of the crown in our islands. But whether monarchs may approve of the blind fidelity to "loyalty" that led to the wars of 1715 and 1745 or not, all men must admire the chivalrous self-sacrifice with which the Jacobites flung themselves into the unequal fray.

It is true that the Catholics of the North of England had promised to take up the Stuart cause, and were said to be ready with many in the border counties to join the Highland host. But how small was that host! How badly armed and disciplined, and how ill equipped with money or any resource beyond its own fierce enthusiasm! There was not even a single battery of artillery, and it was with only a troop of cavalry and ten to eleven thousand ragged infantry that the champions of the white cockade marched boldly into the great and populous and wealthy England to coerce its teeming midlands and conquer its splendid capital. What marvellous daring and what extraordinary success crowned for a while the hardihood which many of the devoted gentlemen who joined the Prince must have seen to be madness! "Scotland for Ever. No Union." A fatal cry, and doubly fatal when success depended on the adhesion of the English Jacobites, who were, indeed, numerous enough in many a county to set alight vain hopes and fiery longings yet to be read in the beautiful stanzas of the Scottish poetry, and heard in the songs of which the defeated party has almost a monopoly.

But there was not only fidelity to a fallen king shown forth in the great risings in the north. There was also the passionate assertion of that independence which had made the Scottish nation re-

gard England as the "Auld Enemy" until Scotland's own statesmen led her to embrace the ancient foe, and under Scotland's own king to commence an alliance which was intended to heal all old wounds by the indissoluble welding of hitherto separated interests into one commonwealth, to the equal profit and advantage of both peoples. One nation should henceforth cleave the seas of circumstance, and that nation should be called the British. To all the outer world, to every foreigner, the two should be indivisible. At home each was to keep its own laws and usages, and no man could uproot the glorious history of either.

The gain was undoubtedly chiefly for the weaker and the poorer people. Yet this was not acknowledged by many, and was, indeed, seen by few. In Edinburgh, especially, where the departure of the court and the people it brought was justly dreaded as the taking-away of profitable business, the mob was in arms. It could not have been foreseen by those who watched the preparations for departure made by all the wealthiest and the foremost men among the Scots that within the lifetime of their own grandchildren that old Edinburgh, in whose narrow streets and close "wynds" the Anti-Unionists shouted and swore, would be but a picturesque corner in a city greater than any that existed in their day, with the sole exception of London. They saw only, as Lord Belhaven pathetically said in the Parliament House, that it "was the end of an old song." They could not know that it was the prelude to such a burst of glorious harmony as would fill the world with the triumphal notes of hymns of victory that have followed Britain's march over regions wider than even a Scot had ever travelled. They had felt the power of England's enmity. Their commerce had been hindered, their influence withered, under the influence of her jealousy. They could not believe the enemy of their fathers would be the helpmate of their children.

And thus when "the Bonny Prince" called to them to maintain his rights, they hesitated not, but joined him, and when they saw how hopeless was his cause, they did not falter. Not a man forsook him. That grand loyalty would not permit any Highlander, however wretched, to betray the Prince after his defeat, when a word or a gesture would have put £25,000 into the poor man's pocket, and have consigned the "Pretender" to prison. So when affairs were darkest, and the chief and the gentlemen

around him knew that their heads and lands would pay the forfeit, the only cry was "onward" and "attack." For the Holy Church, for their scarcely less holy King, into the jaws of death, into the scenes of contumely, with the scaffold and the headsman in the foreground, they marched, glad to give their all and the hopes of their sons for the cause of the Prince. It was a noble devotion, condemn it as we may as a mistake, and it was fed by the remembrance of their ancient independent nationality. It was "Home Rule" with a cause, and a creed, and a history to justify it. They had the knowledge of the glory they had acquired in separation. They had not the wisdom to anticipate the good of the union. They saw only the merging of the old and known into something strange and untried. We, looking back with after-knowledge, must not blame them who could not call expansion patriotism.

It has taken nearly two centuries to make the truth very clear ; and even now there is among a few an attempt to deny it, and to declare that the spirit of Scotch nationality would be purer and better without being tied to the clay of the British body. Education itself helps to keep this feeling alive. Just as every boy in the United States hates England when he reads at school of the American War of Independence, and considers Bunker Hill as an undoubted victory, so every urchin in Scotland revels in visions of the heroic feats of Wallace and Bruce, and of the day when the dead Douglas won the fight at Chevy Chase, and thinks how he, too, would enjoy such days, and how easy it would be to "whip" 120,000 English with 30,000 Scots, as did the good King Robert on that morning under the hill of Stirling in 1314. And he knows that from those far-away times onward to those of which he may have heard his great-grandfather speak there were fights between Scotch armies and English armies, in which the Southron did not come off best without Scotch help, and he very rightly thinks that he could fight three Englishmen at least. That old border line was made good against the wealthier nation for a thousand years, and it could again be held if necessary. So his pride swells, and he, at all events, is not among those against whom Walter Scott wrote :

"Breathes there a man with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said,
'This is my own, my native land' ?"

Is it necessary to hold that border line? Some people think nowadays that they will emulate Bruce and Wallace, and because they can't get all they want in agrarian disputes and social equality, and this and that in local wrangles, the work of the eighteenth century is to be revised and the great union is to be debased and annulled for the elevation of their little selves.

One of the most intensely "national" of Scots, and one of Scotland's best writers,—a local man to the bone, and ready to hate all that was antagonistic to what is noble in a national and race spirit,—wrote thus after he had paced for the first time the transept of Westminster Abbey. He had not visited England until middle life, and his book on his "First Impressions of England and Her People" is one that can be read by all at any time with pleasure and instruction. His eye was as keen to note the characteristics of the men around him as it was to examine his own tendencies, and he would have despised himself if he had taken color from mere surroundings. But he was proud to color his own mind with the illumination of others, and the fuller light with which his was filled came because he did not hedge himself round with the walls of narrowness and isolation. He saw on the tombstones in the Abbey the names of the poets and writers whose words had cheered him at evening after the long hours of his mason's toil, and whose sentiment had been with him by day and by night. Among them he saw his own countryman, Campbell, but he thinks of all the great dust beneath his feet and writes :

"How thoroughly had they served to break down, in my mind at least, the narrower and more illiberal partialities of country, leaving undisturbed, however, all that was worthy of being cherished in my attachment to poor old Scotland. I learned to deem the English poet not less my countryman than the Scot, if I but felt the true human heart beating in his bosom."

"The narrower and more illiberal partialities of country," as opposed to the pride in a great nationality to which we may ourselves belong through the patriotism of our forefathers—this is the distinction which over and over again must be made and enforced on those who would degrade patriotism into a mere provincial peacocking. If the superficial study of history inclines the boy to be patriotic in the narrower and less worthy sense, its continued study will make the man consider himself the more fortunate the larger and more cohesive is that flag which symbolizes a country able not only to look back on the feats that wove

together its different tribes, but proud of the genius that formed the races into a political power. That power need seek no enhancement of reputation in the remembrance of the struggles between its own sections in the past, but relies for its self-respect on its force in the rivalry of nations in the present.

Yet there are a few who would like to see Scotland talk only of her pedigree and of her pipers, of her tartans, her feuds, of clans and churches. The feeling has arisen on account of the multiplicity of work devolving on Parliament, which has sometimes made that assembly slow to get quickly either into or through purely Scottish business. It would be as great folly to take up the false and mischievous position over against England of "a separate national parliament, with an executive proceeding therefrom," as it would be to despise and reject the devolution of powers on local bodies for the purpose of lightening the work of the central Parliament at Westminster. A step in the right direction has recently been made in the constitution of county councils elected on a wide franchise. This may yet be further developed.

But what many of those who clamor loudest for a revived Scottish parliament want is to effect changes in the tenure of property and interference with the obligation of contract which would not be tolerated in America. The Imperial Parliament has done some things which encourage these gentlemen to hope that the transfer of property from one individual to another, or of goods from one class to another, may not be wholly impracticable even with an Imperial Parliament governing the realms. With a purely national or home-rule parliament, representing in one chamber the majority of Scotland alone, they fancy that it would be easy to take, for instance, property in land from one class and give it to another. It was said long ago that the British, slow as they are, have proved themselves to be often capable of being filled with a greater amount of enthusiasm for an idea than other nations. Just as in London, if a man appears who has filled the newspapers with accounts of his travels, his fights, or his adventures of any kind, he becomes the "lion" of the season, and is petted and spoiled by "society," so does the British public sometimes in its Parliament awake to a fit of enthusiasm to pet some special trade or class.

It was so with the so-called "Crofters" of late. They were said to be the lost tribes of a kind of Tartan Judah, and their story

formed a romantic trilogy which began with patriarchal manners, continued through an era of wondrous loyalty to chief and king, and was terminating under the eyes of an indignant but sleepy world in the acts that were disinheriting them of their patrimony and depopulating the land by their enforced exile to the wilds of inhospitable America. Virtue awoke in the breast of the British politician. He was quite aware that this excellent peasantry never possessed any more rights than did the peasantry of England, who used to cultivate the land exactly as the Crofters do; namely, dividing the land like a "crazy" quilt exhibited at an American fair, each man having during one year to tend half a dozen of the different patches apart from each other. During the next year he had to tend other patches, because it was considered in the village right that each should have "turn about." The system was hopeless as regards agriculture, and in all parts of the country, except in the Highlands, where want of communication and Gaelic had made people more content than elsewhere when they starved, the system had given place to another more adapted to get food out of the land for the public at large and enhance the value of the soil. They had no more right than had any other peasants to the plots they occupied. Leases were never granted to them, because they were part of the fighting "outfit of the chief," bound to do his service in peace or war, give his daughters a "tocher" when they married, cart and carry for him; and all this service was in exchange for the safety and protection he was supposed to be able to give to them. Every estate history in the Highlands could point to this absolute rule, tempered only by prudence, and show how the small tenants were ordered out by their chief to attack other tribes, and to be shifted from one set of farms to another, or be arbitrarily dealt with in other ways.

This was history, and it may be very shocking that it was history, and that the clansmen allowed it; but patriarchal sway was absolute, shocking as the fact may be. These people, therefore, had far less right to their farms than had those in England who had been under its common law for ages. But history was made to serve virtue, and, as it is always pleasant to show generosity to the poor, Parliament decreed that any house built by the landowner should on all "crofts" become the property of the land-occupier, and that, further, when any five peasants wanted their

holdings enlarged, the addition was to be taken from the nearest good farm, at the discretion of a roving party of commissioners, who should act as they thought best on these general principles : (1) that the rent paid for a holding should never be more than the present occupier could easily pay, to the exclusion of any other man ; (2) that the owner's improvements should become the tenant's, for the occupier was now to have not only his rent adjusted, but also to have the right to remain forever where he found himself so long as he paid the low rent ; (3) he could bequeath his holding as property to his successor. Any arrears of rent were also either cancelled by order of the commission or greatly cut down. American readers will say they guess that was pretty drastic legislation. And so it was. We shall see what are the fruits in a few years. Meanwhile the politicians who desire the Crofters' votes tell them that they must have a present made to them of cattle and sheep to stock the lands they will yet take from the neighboring land-owner to add to their holdings.

Opinions will differ as to whether it was right to fix a "fair rent." It is not done elsewhere, but in the case of the poorest of the peasants I, for one, think it was very defensible. But in regard to the further measures, we shall see whether the strings of the land-owner's purse are not now greatly tightened in subscribing to help the peasant who has been placed in a position which tempts the land-owner to look upon him, not as his friend whom he would like to help, but as his natural enemy, who may conspire with others against him. Most of the railways, the piers, and other public improvements, as well as all the large drainage operations, have hitherto been undertaken by the land-owner, who had a pride in doing them, and a satisfaction in seeing them make his property better and his people happier. The legislation now enacted tends to cut off his sympathy, and, in a wild and barren region where the kindly good-neighborship of the "big man" is of great advantage to the poor, to deprive the peasant of the aid and countenance he has hitherto had. An American may think the peasant is all the better without such patronage. If the land were good, it might be so, but in a wet climate and on bad soil can a man be as independent as he may become on the prairies of Nebraska or Iowa ? The query is a painful one to those who know the Highlands, and hear the very different tone which men now assume when they speak of

laying out their money elsewhere than in places where benevolent legislation confiscates it for the assumed benefit of the tenant, who is accidentally at the moment the recipient of such enforced and temporary bounty. They who have pointed this out are denounced as "depopulators" and "grasping landlords," but time will show whether they or the people's noisy advocates at election times are the true friends of the Crofters.

Every person having a remembrance of Scottish song and story, every well-wisher to the most romantic part of the old country, will desire that as many of the peasantry as can remain with comfort to themselves on the wild shores and healthy glens shall be enabled to do so. The hateful, but ever-necessary and ever-recurring, question, "What will pay best"?—not for the land-owner, but also for the land-occupiers—must, however, be asked. They who have known comfort in the towns or in the better-equipped homesteads of the fertile low country, or in the States, or in the great colonies of Britain, will not be so contented with the old ways which were good enough for their forefathers. In one of the most fertile of the Hebrides, the island of Islay, Pennant, in the middle of the last century, saw the people rushing down to the strand to meet a vessel, for in that ship they saw their only hope of sustaining existence. They were starving, and it was bringing flour. Such scenes were possible in the "good old days." They are not so now, but they would again be possible in the Lewis and in some of the over-populated districts were it not that steamers and charity can bring more certain aid than was possible in the days when Pennant voyaged and truthfully wrote all he heard and saw. To keep the Highlander "on the land" may not always be a kindness to him.

"What is the name of that glen?" asked a tourist of the stage-driver in the Highlands. "The Devil's Glen, ma'am," was the answer, and the ejaculation which followed from the tourist was natural, when she emphatically murmured: "Poor Devil!"

But the land-hunger is sufficient in the Highlands, as in Ireland, to make persons accustomed to the wet climate anxious to live there even on bad land. It is also not only the Crofter who wishes for more soil to squat upon, but others envy even his poor estate. There are numbers greatly in excess of the number of Crofters who demand of him some "rigs" of his land whereon to plant potatoes. There are many who cannot get this. They are

told by their benevolent friends, the politicians who woo their votes, that they too must have land, and that they must not think of emigrating, for they must get what they can of the bad lands at home rather than in America or Australia. Accordingly the following language is heard. It was used last week in the Lewis, a large Hebridean island, to a former minister of the Crown, who, at present in opposition, hopes to get into power again on some wave of Gladstonian tergiversation. He was told that it was not forgotten by the Crofters that, when, a few years ago, they had taken the law into their own hands with a fair prospect of driving out the cattle of the land-owner and putting their own upon the grazings, the Gladstonian delinquent before them had acquiesced in the sending of an armed force to aid the police, who had been overpowered. They were willing to let these bygones be bygones so soon as they had an assurance that the enforcement of law by the supreme government would not be repeated, but they warned him that they would take up equal arms should the same act be repeated by any government. The burden, they continued, that took away the breath of a Crofter was that he dragged behind him the cotters and squatters. If there was any disorder, they would hold the government responsible. As long as they had thousands upon thousands of landless cotters, the government, in allowing good arable farms to dangle before the eyes of the landless, starving, desperate, hopeless men, were tempting these men to crime.

The ex-minister replied by saying that he wanted all that was good in the ancient state of the Highlands restored, by which he doubtless meant the rapid suspension by the neck of all intrusive politicians. His audience accepted his words as an omen that every landed Crofter would soon have his little farm doubled in size at the expense of his neighbors, and that every squatter and every cotter who has no land should have land granted him by the government, so that he should no longer bother the Crofter; and of course a good grant must be made to all landless men so that they may buy cattle, sheep, and "outfit" to stock any land given to them by a grateful public.

Some Americans may think, on reading these statements, that the persons who make these demands on the goods of their neighbors cannot much care for religion. They would be mistaken. For the moment these people have agreed that the "land ques-

tion" comes before the church question. But when every man shall have a little farm stocked by the state and granted rent free, then, it is agreed, there must be a great deal of church talk. The form that their interest in church matters assumes is an interest in the refusal of any land-tax that may go with the land that may be given them. Of course they should have the land free of any drawback in the way of payment to anybody. But these demands are the dishonest men's demands. The bulk of the people pay something now for their Free-Church ministers, and the majority are quite willing to pay for the luxury of a little argument on creed and "Erastianism." Most of the clergy who minister to them are subsidized by richer members of their church in the south and east of Scotland, but they do not contribute for their sustenance. The number of adherents the Free Church possesses in the Highlands and islands is remarkable. There is a zone of Roman Catholic country, but the bulk of the western men are Presbyterian, of the division of that church which broke off from the Established State Church in 1843, mainly on the question of the election of the pastors by the congregations. Although "patronage," or the nomination of a clergyman to a parish by a patron, became only a nominal right many years ago, and has now for some time been formally and legally abolished, the Free Church still maintains its separate organization.

The United Presbyterian Church is another large body, detesting to a greater degree than do the adherents of the Free Church all connection between church and state. In matters of general government, organization, ritual, and usage, the three bodies, "Established," "Free," and "United Presbyterian," are precisely alike. There may be a little more architecture in the Established churches, but that is doubtful. There may also among them be a few more organs used during worship, and there may in some instances be more written prayers used and a larger number of hymns sung, where in other services you will only hear the psalms of David sung according to a version made in the seventeenth century by a Welshman named Rouse, who was well inspired in the case of a few of his versions, and prompted by the demon of discord in the majority of his "renderings." But they are all in rhyme, and have attained through association a semi-sacred tenure in many Presbyterian minds, not to be disturbed by any afterthought or experience. Milton's versions are by many considered

barbarous in comparison with the following specimen by Mr. Rouse :

" Thus grievéd was my heart in me,
And me my reins oppress ;
So rude was I and ignorant,
And in Thy sight a beast."

They all sing this with equal satisfaction. Why should they not join in having one national church "established" in the national reverence and love ? You may well ask. Questions are proverbially discreet ; the answers seldom. So it is best to decline to answer. To sound the unfathomable is an unprofitable task. The perverseness of human nature gives the best answer.

But there is a strong party anxious to disestablish the state section of the Presbyterians and to disendow the church and apply the funds to education. It is probable they will succeed in severing the connection of the state, but not with the bulk of the church's property. This was of old given for the good of the donor's soul, for the support of the church, and for the education of children, which the Roman Catholic Church undertook almost alone in the middle ages. Since those times the church property has greatly increased by gifts which could not without the grossest impropriety be diverted to other uses than those for which they were designed. In Canada the various religious bodies have not kept up the distinction so tenaciously held in the old country, and the presumption is that in Scotland also union would take place after a time should the connection with the state be dissolved. The "Establishment" has formed "church-defence associations," and one of the most eloquent of her "divines" spoke a few days ago to this effect :

"All that the Scottish Church wanted was this, that they would allow no man to go to Parliament and represent the opinion of Scotland who had pledged himself for disestablishment until it had been put as a fair, clear issue before the Scottish people. This was not a question that had to do with the three Presbyterian churches. It had to do with the great spiritual and moral interests that underlay our churches. It was a religious question affecting our dear land for generations yet to come. Disestablishment meant that the corporate life of the nation would be cut off from all recognition of the Supreme Being as its Ruler, and would become atheistic or agnostic. The act to disestablish the church was, when viewed rightly, an act of disloyalty to God and his Christ. In regard to disendowment, the endowments were the legacies or bequeathments of pious generations gone by for the keeping up of the parish church and the religious objects of the day. They were now being used for the same purpose as for the last 1,000 years. What had the state to do with that? The state never gave these endowments, and the state had no right to alienate them as long as they were used for the religious wel-

fare of the nation. What would they call an act that would take all the old endowments throughout the length and breadth of Scotland? He would tell them what it was called in the Bible. It was called robbery of God. The Church of Scotland was prepared to share these endowments to-morrow with the Free Church, with the United Presbyterian Church, on the one condition that they were kept for the purposes for which they were given, namely, the worship of God and for his religion. They were told that it was an injustice, an anomaly, but, at the same time, their opponents called endowments a bagatelle. Now it was the defenders of the churches' turn to influence candidates for Parliament. They were to make their voices heard as a national church, and they wanted every M. P. and Mr. Gladstone to know that the voices of the Scottish people were against disestablishment. If they were true to themselves, they would never see the old church down."

After his late manner of examining, inquiring, and of humbly following to alter that which he formerly defended, Mr. Gladstone has declared he is ready to follow any expression of the feeling of Scotland. This feeling will, of course, be measured by votes, and it is significant that at the last election the church showed herself strong enough to make a great deal of reticence prevail among the disestablishers on the question of disestablishment because they wanted first to gain a wide haul of votes for the setting up of a separate national secession parliament in Ireland. This probably means that the "Auld Kirk" position was found to be too strong to be forced, and the difficulty of the attack on her will undoubtedly be augmented if the assaulting party declare they desire to loot the camp as well as drive the defenders from their intrenchments.

To an American jurist the chief interest of British politics at present must lie in watching how soon the tendencies of the new voters will make it necessary for Britain to imitate her American cousins in devising something like the fifth amendment to the Constitution. There is no doubt that private property in the old country is not nearly so safe as it is in the new. We are also probably in Britain advancing towards that which we have hitherto carefully avoided, namely, a written constitution. Whatever powers may be delegated by the Parliament to local assemblies, to provincial or to county representative bodies, must be clearly defined. Hitherto Englishmen have hated exact definitions, and the common-sense of the comparatively few has been allowed to guide and govern the "happy-go-lucky" and "one-bit-at-a-time" method of British political procedure. With sections setting up, as Ireland now does, for a separate national recognition, and with the overcrowded population in England finding it more and more difficult to get food and elbow-room, more attacks

on property and more impatience of the slow justice of the supreme government are sure to arise. Greater power must be given to localities to settle matters among themselves, and it will be necessary to define clearly and concisely, and in a manner that can leave no doubt, how far the local powers extend. Thus gradually we shall arrive at having a good written constitution, such as has for so long been found of use and necessity in America.

Of other and minor Scottish political affairs it is not necessary to speak, for they can hardly interest any one not dwelling in the land of cakes and caution. It is amusing to see Gladstonian candidates fishing for Irish national votes by telling the numerous fishermen that "free fishing," or no restriction on property in fish, will be recognized; and the American who spends Federal dollars in restocking the depleted waters where salmon used to be and are not, and in filling the waters even of the sea with ova that are to thrive again in the overfished marine banks, will think with satisfaction that soon his salmon will be the only salmon in the market, should such a "generous and liberal" plank be successful in the British reformers' platform. But these things are of little general interest, and will engross the attention of the natural scientist rather than of the philosophical watcher of politics. Scotchmen are probably shrewd enough not to be inoculated to any fatal extent with the periodical Irish small-pox of discontent; and if they think that more people can, with decent comfort, be housed in Scotland, and that they can gain more than they lose by a dislocation of the close union with England, they will effect their wishes, but will not act until they are very sure of the ground on which they venture, for they do not wish to pull their hands out of the full pockets of the Southron, where they have now been handling the "red, red gowd" for considerably over a century.

LORNE.