

British American Presbyterian.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AT TORONTO, CANADA.

TERMS: \$2 a year, in advance. Postage, by mail, 25 cents per year, payable at the time of delivery. Active Correspondents and Local Agents wanted, to whom Liberal commissions will be paid. Cheques and Post Office Orders should be drawn in favour of the Publisher. Address: C. BLACKETT ROBINSON, Publisher and Proprietor. Office:—No. 41 Melinda St.; House:—No. 9, Gerrard St., Toronto.

ADVERTISING RATES.

Table with columns: Space, 1 Mo., 3 Mo., 6 Mo., 1 Year. Rows include One column, Half column, Quarter column, One-sixth column, One-eighth column, One-sixteenth column, 12 lines or 1 inch, 6 to 8 lines, 4 to 6, 4 lines and under.

No double columns; cuts 25 per cent. extra; specials in reading matter 15 cents. per line each insertion.

Any irregularity in the receipt of the Pressy copies will be immediately rectified on notice being sent by Postal Card or otherwise.

British American Presbyterian.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, JULY 19, 1872.

TOPICS OF THE WEEK.

The rumor that one of Mr. Livingstone's sons had joined the Church of Rome has been confirmed by authority.

In England the halibut has become law, the Lords yielding to the inevitable, as to a certain stage of any great public question they inevitably must.

The adoption of Horace Greeley by the Democratic Convention at Baltimore has greatly changed the character of the conflict. General Grant will now have a hard run, but the general feeling is that after all he will be victorious.

The oldest inhabitant scarcely remembers a more oppressive "heated term" than we have had since the beginning of July. It has required one to have a lively sense of duty to induce him to do anything. Even politicians in the prospect of a contested election feel the depressing influence of the weather.

The Rev. Mr. Gordon, the Presbyterian Missionary at Erromanga, in the South Seas, is said to have been murdered. If this be so, it may be hid to the door of unprincipled European traders and kidnapers, who have acted so tyrannically and barbarously as to fill natives with dislike to anything or person connected with Europe. Mr. Gordon was well known in Ontario among the Presbyterians. We still hope that there may have been some mistake, and that Mr. G. is yet alive. His brother, it will be remembered, was also murdered.

Bismark has given the Jesuits summary notice to quit Germany. They are, he avers, mere political fire brands, always disloyal subjects, and always plotting mischief. Perhaps before the whole play is played out other governments will make the same discovery. It is still too much the case that that celebrated fraternity can be spoken of as in former days. "They come in like hounds, to raven like wolves, to be driven out like dogs, and to return like flying eagles." The times are unfavourable to carrying out the fourth part of the programme; but it will be tried again, as it has been only too successfully in other days.

Stanley, the New York Herald's African explorer, writes at length an account of his interview with Livingstone, and gives a sketch of the great traveller's experiences. The narrative is curious, and has a wonderfully readable look about it. It seems, however, generally accepted as truthful, though there are some doubts. Time will settle the whole affair, as, according to accounts, Stanley is now very near England, bearing autograph letters from Livingstone himself. This will determine the matter finally. What if Livingstone don't come home at the end of two years? Will there have to be another expedition? or will Stanley, if spared, again rush to the rescue?

We notice that the members of Dr. McLeod's Church in the Barony Parish, have petitioned the Crown, who is patron of the living, to grant to the people the choice of a successor to the doctor. It is understood that this petition will be acceded to, or, at least, that a large fee will be given, from which the choice may be made.

The absorbing topic in Canada at present is the coming elections. The writs have been issued, returnable on the 4th of September, and all parties are busy preparing for the contest, with what success, time will show. Both sides profess to be very confident of gaining an overwhelming victory, and both may so far be disappointed. That a large amount of money will be spent, is we fear, too certain. The more the money and the greater the disgrace.

The indirect elections having been dropped, the Geneva arbitration goes on to the entire satisfaction of the overwhelming majority of the most intelligent people in both countries. Let us hope this arbitration will introduce a new era in the settlement of national disputes. Nothing could well be worse than the old plan of setting thousands of persons who had no possible quarrel with each other to the frightful work of mutual slaughter. Arbitration ought to be both cheaper, more effective, and in every respect more honourable; and it is found that nations are sufficiently advanced in civilization and good sense to submit to the decision of neutral parties; who shall after that say that the former times were better than these?

THE KEITH CASE.

We have more than once directed attention to this curiously complicated case that has for some time past been before our law courts and has been causing a good deal of talk both in Canada and Scotland. Our readers know pretty well how the whole difficulty originated and how matters have been going from bad to worse, till now apparently it has been ruled that Roman Catholic priests may aid and abet the abduction of children from their natural and legal guardians, and go scot free. We have already told how Mr. Keith sought to secure his children by serving a writ of habeas corpus upon Mrs. Keith, and also upon Archbishop Lynch and Father Jamot. Mrs. Keith, while she could not plead ignorance of where the children were, refused to produce them, and thus rendered herself liable to be sent to prison for contempt of court. The Archbishop and Father Jamot, pleaded that they knew nothing about the matter, that they had no power over the children, and that they had never in one way or other counselled their removal from their father's house. There was a good deal of Jesuitical evocation in the proceedings of those two gentlemen and by a legal quibble, they were relieved from personal judicial examination.

The case was then removed to the Court of Chancery, and the children made wards of the Court. No quibbles could prevent called witnesses being brought up for examination there, and consequently to avoid the damaging disclosures that they would have been forced to make, these Reverend gentlemen lodged a plea against their being examined, which the Judge finds himself obliged as he thinks to accept, though he does it with great reluctance.

As we have stated, these priests pleaded formerly that they had had nothing to do with the abduction of the children, and had neither counselled nor abetted the proceeding one way or other. If this had been literally and honestly the fact their course would apparently have been a very smooth and a very safe one. They need have feared no examination, for they had neither knowledge nor power in the premises. We have, however, already given their plea in full, and as our readers will remember, they in that claim exemption from such examination altogether on the ground that no one is bound to say anything that might criminate himself, and that the answers they would be obliged to give would involve such crimination. Privilege and the Treaty of Paris they also pleaded in bar of the threatened ordeal, but what we have stated was the substance of the anchor upon which they chiefly depended. To abduct or detain a ward in Chancery, or

to aid or abet in such abduction or detention involves a charge of felony, and they feared on this account.

It will be observed that in taking this stand they changed altogether their position. They had urged that they had had no connection whatever with the abduction, and had no power over the children. What possibility was there in that case to criminate themselves? The more they stated the whole truth and nothing but the truth, the more their unimpeachable innocence would appear. All that however has now been changed. They are afraid to be put to the question lest they criminate themselves! In other words, if they plead according to the truth, they are felons though not proved to be so, and were formerly days. If they plead according to truth formerly, they are now liars, while they very brazenly get erroneously hint that they are not felons. It is not we who have put them on the horns of this dilemma, but themselves or their legal advisers, and they can take which horn they prefer, though in either case not very much we should think to their comfort or credit. The Judge has ruled that he must accept this plea, and under the shelter of this most miserable and discreditable subterfuge, these clerical dignitaries escape the "question" in the meantime. The finding of the Judge has, however, been appealed from; and, keeping in view their former plea, the full bench may conclude that these gentlemen could not criminate themselves in a matter in which they had neither directly or indirectly any part.

If, however, the plea is sustained, then we cannot see that Mr. Keith can have any other hold upon those who virtually say we know all about it, and took such a part in the matter as would land us in the felon's dock, but we are not bound to criminate ourselves, and therefore we won't answer. In that case in all likelihood Mr. Keith will never see his children again, and these clerical gentlemen will be able to snap their fingers in his face and laugh at the simplicity which thought that the father could successfully contend against the confessor and the priest.

This is a very grave matter. These priests were Mrs. Keith's spiritual advisers, and they will not tell what advice they gave her about stealing her children from their father's authority for fear of criminating themselves! How could they possibly criminate themselves if they advised her to obey the law of God and man, both of which give supreme family authority to the father? Suppose Mrs. K. had murdered those children, and had previously asked Father Jamot's advice on the subject, what could be thought if that reverend gentleman would not submit to a judicial enquiry as to his advice for fear of criminating himself? Notoriously if one word of objection had been interposed by these "holy fathers" Mrs. K. would not durst not have done as she has. But not only has that word not been spoken, practically though not formally and legally, they have acknowledged that they aided and abetted her in the proceeding.

As we have already mentioned, Mrs. K. has also followed her other two children to Scotland, and has endeavored with the assistance of Roman Catholic emissaries, both by force and fraud to abduct these two boys from the care of their legally appointed guardian, and has been baffled in her projects only by very cautious and very decided proceedings. Who supplied her with money? With whom did she leave the three abducted children when she went to Scotland? Archbishop Lynch and Father Jamot might have been able to throw light on these and kindred points, but of course a man is not bound to criminate himself! and these reverend gentlemen, therefore, cautiously decline the overture. What is the consequence of all this? Mr. Keith's home is broken up. His children are all scattered and removed from his care, and he is told that unless he surrender the two boys in Scotland to be disposed of as their mother and her advisers think best, he will never see the other three while he lives. It is not now pretended that the Roman Catholic officials do not know where those children are, nor is it for one moment argued that Mrs. K. would for a single day persist in any course in opposition to her spiritual advisers. But there it is. A wife

without the knowledge and sanction of her husband can leave his home, travel so far as he knows unprotected for thousands of miles, be supplied with money, can assume a false character, and under a false name can introduce herself into a house for the purpose of taking away, if necessary by force, children faced there by their father, and all under the sanction of religion and under the advice and guidance of religious teachers, besides retaining those already abducted. Are Protestants of the present day prepared to say that all this is right and that there is no remedy. The house where these boys live has to be guarded like a prison. Mrs. Keith knowing that at a certain time of the day only a lady was with them brought four men, and had a cab standing at a respectable distance evidently for forcible abduction. Are we to blame a weak, excitable woman for all that? Nay, verily, the great weight of responsibility lies on quite different shoulders, as will be seen before all the play is played out. We care not how political tricksters may try to smooth it all over in order to secure the Catholic vote to this party or that. We say the whole proceeding is simply infamous, and that not so much in reference to the ostensible agent as to the sleek demagogue wire pullers behind the scenes.

EXCURSIONS FOR POOR CHILDREN.

Sabbath School excursions serve more important purposes than affording a mere day's relaxation for the little folks. They are educators as well, both for head and heart, and often are the only means of letting many know that the world is actually a great deal larger than they thought it was. A yearly excursion to a convenient distance ought, in our opinion, then, to be a regular part of the arrangements in every well-organized Sabbath School; not for the purpose of drawing in scholars merely, but for genuine instruction, and healthy expansion of thought and feeling. We are glad to see this more and more acted upon. And those who oppose such things as clap-trap, and inconsistent with the object of Sunday schools, show that they are in danger of becoming old fogies, and don't know what they are saying.

We notice another movement in this direction, which has been inaugurated in New York, and is of a very praiseworthy kind. It is to get up excursions into the country for poor, and such children who were never perhaps without the city limits, and who could never get away, either in a Sunday school excursion, or in any other way. It is proving a complete success. Already, two excursions have taken place, which took out into the country 1,300 children, and it was calculated that in the course of the season the friends in charge will be able to take out 10,000 in the same way. Ministers, city missionaries, superintendents of industrial schools, and various benevolent gentlemen, are entering enthusiastically into the work, and funds are coming in abundantly. Already more than \$5000 have been sent into the New York Times office, nearly a thousand coming in in two days. Poor sick children are also to be attended to, in the way of procuring fans, ice, medicine, nourishing food, &c. Now this is very fine. Why should not some of our benevolent friends in Canada follow suit? There are poor sick children with us as well as in New York.

HORSE RACING AND BETTING.

Every decent, sensible person is coming fast to the opinion that horse racing is a curse and a nuisance, and its professed benefits in the way of improving the breed of horses, &c., a mere delusion and snare. To have horse races established in any locality, is felt to be a public calamity, securing for the time a high carnival of blackguardism and every kind of rascality. No one can fully estimate the amount of injury that every such race does to the sobriety, decency and integrity of the community, and one is therefore glad to see that the current of public opinion, both in the old country and here, is so setting that, let titled and untitled blacklegs, of every degree of raffishness, protest as they may, it is doomed to the same fate as cock-fighting and pugilism. Prime Ministers may patronize it, Dukes and Lords may figure as its abettors, while those opposed to

it may be denounced as sour-faced humbugs. It does not matter. The thing has become too large a piece of lying, swindling, and general immorality, to make serious headway very much longer. Respectable turfites are withdrawing; even fashionable fools are withdrawing; they are shocked, and feel it necessary to be rather deprecating and apologetic, while falsehood and fraud are so notoriously universal about the whole, that it is acknowledged without these, "books" could not be made, and races would not pay.

When mere boys are robbing their masters' tills, sons forging their fathers' names, and young nobles going to the dogs, through the insane love of betting on race horses, it is about time that a halt were called. We hope to see the day, and that soon, when any respectable man would as little allow his name to be used in connection with a horse race, as he would figure as second at a "mill," or parade his betting success over a "main of cocks."

Mr. Thomas Hughes ("Tom Brown") did himself honor by opposing the adjournment of the British Parliament on the Derby day, and is now putting through a stringent law on betting, which will surround horse racing with difficulties. We have never been admirers of "Tom," whom we have always looked on as a fussy, officious personage, with not much balance of judgment or general weight of character, but really, if he goes on at this rate, we shall have to change our mind, and believe that after all his "three tailors of Tooley Street" airs, there is more in the "litt'le man" than from his books and speeches, we had been inclined to believe.

HABITUAL DRUNKARDS.

The progress of opinion in Britain on the subject of Drunkards is seen very clearly in the report of the select Committee of the House of Commons on Habitual Drunkards. This report lately issued among the Parliamentary papers, recommends among other things, that there should be provided "Sanatoria or Reformatories for those who, notwithstanding the plainest considerations of health, interest and duty, are going over to habits of intemperance so as to render them unable to control themselves, and incapable of managing their own affairs, or such as to render them in any way dangerous to themselves or others." These establishments, it is said, should be divided into two classes A and B. A would be for those who are able out of their own resources or out of those of their own relations to pay the cost of their residence therein. These, whether promoted by private enterprise or by associations can be profitably and successfully conducted. The class B would be for those who are unable to contribute or only partially. These must be established by State or local authorities and at first at the cost, though there is good reason to believe that they can be made wholly or partially self-supporting. The admission should be in the opinion of the Committee be either voluntary or by compulsion. In either case the person entering should not be allowed to leave except under conditions to be laid down, and the power to prevent their leaving should by law be conferred on the manager. Though practically the power would be seldom put in force, it would be useless to establish the institution without it. The Committee also recommend that the provisions of the Habitual Criminal Act should be applicable so far to Drunkards, and that an Habitual Drunkards register should be kept. No wonder that such recommendations should provoke hostile criticism, and queries about the liberty of the subject being interfered with. But in the meantime, the recommendations and the outcries alike tell of progress. The next thing is to look to those habitually engaged in making Drunkards. Most certainly that business will have to be put down with a high hand as decidedly hostile to the public welfare. Strange to license men to live by drunkenness and then recommend public asylums and reformatory establishments for their victims!

The Halifax Presbyterian Witness, in noticing the position taken by Archbishop Lynch and Father Jamot in the Keith case, when before the Court of Chancery, says:—"It will be observed that the priests are fighting to procure the legal recognition of the Confession in Canada as an impregnable barrier behind which the law is powerless to look, and under whose shelter kidnapping and every other enormity may be safely carried on, and Rome be virtually made supreme ruler in civil as well as spiritual matters."