

THE TRUE WITNESS... IS PUBLISHED BY THE Post Printing & Publishing Company... 761 CRAIG ST., Montreal, Canada...

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 27, 1883

CATHOLIC CALENDAR

THURSDAY, 26.—St. Ignace, Bishop and Martyr. Vigil of St. Peter and Paul. Brute (1839) and St. Paul (1877), Vincennes, Ind.
FRIDAY, 27.—St. Peter and Paul, Apostles. One, Bp. Krantener, Green Bay, 1875.
SATURDAY, 28.—Commemoration of St. Paul.
SUNDAY, 29.—Seventh Sunday after Pentecost. Feast of the Precious Blood. (High Mass of SS. Peter and Paul.) Octave of St. John Baptist. Epist. Heb. ix. 11-15; Gosp. John xix. 30-35; Last Gosp. Matt. vii. 15-21.

MONDAY, 30.—Vigilation of the B. V. M.
TUESDAY, 1.—St. Leo III, Pope and Confessor. Quebec founded, 1608.
WEDNESDAY, 2.—Of the Octave of SS. Peter and Paul. Ep. O'Gorman, Omaha, died, 1874.

Mr. Jno. McNamee, Toledo, Ontario, has consented to act as agent for the Post and True Witness in his locality, and is empowered to collect subscriptions and enroll subscribers.

An Arkansas editor wrote a strong article, criticising the administration of judicial affairs in his particular county. In the course of his criticism he undertook to form and emit the following estimate of the county judge:—"It is with sorrow that we announce that the county judge is a damned fool." The emphasis of the remark was only equalled by the candor which inspired it.

Lord Randolph Churchill is vexing the life out of Gladstone. The young lord has volunteered to prove the Khedive's complicity in the massacres at Alexandria if the Premier would only promise a full inquiry. If such complicity could be shown Gladstone would go down like a shot, hence his hesitation and his unwillingness to accede to the demand of Lord Randolph. The Premier is evidently afraid of the issue, and the indications are that there must be considerable grounds for the charge against the Egyptian ruler, or otherwise Mr. Gladstone would have entered an emphatic denial of Lord Randolph's assertions. The situation is being made rather warm for the Premier, and he deserves it.

WHO LEADS IN EDUCATION?

The United States Bureau of Education recently issued a Circular in which are given the comparative statistics of elementary, secondary and superior education in sixty principal countries. We have often been told that the Irish are an ignorant people and that education among them was lamentably neglected. Perhaps those who were so ready to apply the epithet 'ignorant' to the people of Ireland, will be somewhat astonished and confounded to learn that Ireland today is the foremost nation in the world in the matter of education. This fact has been ascertained and confirmed by the officers of the United States Bureau of Education. In the Circular alluded to above, we find that Ireland takes precedence of all the civilized nations mentioned therein and heads the list with the unparalleled average of 20 per cent of her population of 5,159,829 in attendance at school. The second on the list is the United States, that confers the benefits of education upon nineteen and three-fifths of its population of 59,155,783. The next in line is Germany, which sends an average of fifteen and nine tenths of a population of 45,149,172 to school. France and Switzerland follow, and after them comes England and Wales. Russia occupies but a very limited number of its inhabitants, as only the insignificant average of one and a half per cent of its population of 78,500,000 attend school. Thus Ireland, with her five millions, educates almost as many as Russia does with its seventy-eight millions of a population. These figures tell a story full of significance. Do they not contain the secret of the strength, union and determination of the Irish people during the present agitation for their national rights? We think so. You cannot educate a people and keep them slaves. The moral dynamite of an idea is far more effective than the physical compound; it will penetrate and shatter institutions which the commercial exploiter would not shake. With over one million of her bright and intelligent youth in school, Ireland has nothing to dread, but everything to hope for.

LANDSDOWNE AND THE CANADIAN GOVERNMENT

The opposition to the appointment of Lord Lansdowne as Governor General of Canada is becoming more pronounced every day, and all over the Dominion emphatic expressions of indignation and disapproval are uttered against Gladstone's unwarrantable contempt of Canadian wishes and his utter indifference towards Canadian interests, in appointing such a man as Lansdowne to rule over the Dominion. Our contemporary, the Evening Canadian of Toronto, says, "It is impossible for a free people to forget that the man chosen to sit in the chair of their Chief Magistrate, is the actor of a line of tyrants and Shylocks who has not departed from the ways of his fathers, nor abandoned their sentiments." It will be impossible for a self-respecting people to honor with sincerity the position, while remembering the acts of the incumbent, which are only worthy of contempt. What renders Lansdowne's appointment all the more surprising and objectionable from a mere party point of view, is that he is a "rat." True to his instincts as a landed tyrant, he "rat" from his party on the land question. Some good may come out of the evil of this appointment. We may be able to teach Lord Lansdowne to respect the people, or he may teach us the necessity of having a voice in the choice of our Governor-General. As these are the decided opinions and sentiments of a very large portion of the Canadian people, it is probable that the reign of Lansdowne will not prove a very harmonious period, but may form an unfortunate chapter in the history of the young Dominion, as is generally the case when the ruler and the ruled do not pull well together. Under the circumstances, therefore, we consider it the duty of the Government of the Canadian people to interpose and prevent an undesirable consummation. They should find no difficulty in choosing between the dictates of Downing street and the expressed wishes of the Canadian people. Ordinary foresight, sound statesmanship and a due consideration of consequences should lead our Government to the conclusion that it is better and safer to stand by and protect the interests of our people than to submit to the insult of Lansdowne's appointment and to swallow the snub which Gladstone plainly intended in making it.

THE GROWTH OF THE CHURCH IN GREAT BRITAIN

The progress of the Church in Great Britain during the present century has been simply wonderful. Fifty years ago there were in all England, Scotland and Wales just six bishops, while at present in the same region there are two cardinals and eighteen bishops. In 1833 pieces of worship for Catholics were so rare as to be quite a curiosity, but to-day they have sprung up all over the country, and are the most substantial indication of the slow but sure return of the English people to the Old Faith. Thus in 1833 there were in the thickly populated metropolis but twenty-five modest churches where Catholics could congregate for Divine Service, while the Register now shows that number to have been almost quadrupled. In Liverpool there were five Catholic Churches in 1833; at present the Catholic population is able to fill twenty-five at the several services on the Sunday morning. In Manchester, fifty years ago, four churches sufficed for Catholic adherents, but to-day it takes twenty-one churches to accommodate the Catholic community. These figures are sufficient to indicate the growth of the Church in the large centres of population. The same progressive march is kept up in the country; for we find that in five counties, in which there was not a solitary place of worship in 1833, are now provided with several; thus Northamptonshire has risen from zero to nine; Buckinghamshire has six; Huntingdonshire has two; Rutlandshire two; and Nottinghamshire has increased from nothing to twelve. There is therefore not a county in all England in which the Catholics are not represented and in which they have not their own churches. The following counties are those that have shown the most marked progress:—Lancashire in 1833 contained eighty-four churches, at present the number stands at two hundred and fifty-three; Middlesex has gone from twenty-four to ninety-five; Essex from five to thirty; Hampshire from ten to thirty; Wiltshire from eighteen to thirty-eight; Yorkshire from fifty-one to ninety-six; Leicestershire from six to twenty-one; and so on through the entire list, until we arrive at the grand total of 1,070 churches and chapels in England and Wales where but a half century ago they only numbered 245. If the strides made by the Catholic Church in its progressive march in England, Scotland have been great, in Presbyterian Scotland they have, comparatively speaking, been still greater. In Scotland there were three Bishops in 1833 where at present there are seven. The churches then numbered only forty nine, while now they have increased to the extraordinary number of two hundred and sixty-six, attended by upward of three hundred priests. In matters or on subjects of this nature, nothing is so convincing as certified figures, and to all impartial minds these figures are sufficient evidence of the growth of the Catholic Church in Great Britain, of the spread of her influence, and of the gradual return of the English and Scotch people to the Catholic faith.

THE LATE ARCHBISHOP WOOD.

The Catholic hierarchy of the United States has sustained a severe loss in the death of the great and good Archbishop of Philadelphia, the Most Rev. James Frederick Wood. His Grace passed away after a long and painful illness in the 71st year of his age, at the

Archbishop's residence. His life is one long record of usefulness and devotion to the service of God and of his fellow-men. He was born in Philadelphia April 27, 1813 and was of English parentage and descent. Five years of his youth were spent in England, whither his father had sent him for the purpose of completing his education. Towards 1827 the youthful pupil returned home and during the course of that year went to Cincinnati to take the position of clerk in the United States Bank of that city. He gradually rose until he was promoted to be cashier before the age of majority. After passing eight years in this bank, the young cashier accepted a responsible position in Franklin Bank of Cincinnati, where he served three years. It was about this time that his conversion to the Catholic Church took place, and on April 7th, 1836, the future Archbishop was baptized by the Most Rev. John B. Purcell. The convert now gave up all commercial pursuits and resolved on consecrating himself to the service of the Church into which he had just been received. He accordingly resigned his position in the bank, and proceeded at once to Rome, where he entered upon his ecclesiastical training and studies for the priesthood. After seven years spent in the College of the Propaganda, during which he was appointed Prefect of Discipline, he was on March 25, 1844, at the age of 31, ordained priest by Cardinal Franzoni, Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of the Propaganda. In October of the same year he returned home, and was appointed Assistant Rector of the cathedral at Cincinnati. He subsequently became Pastor of St. Patrick's Church, in that city, and later was appointed coadjutor Bishop of his native city. In 1857, twenty-one years after his reception into the Church and thirteen after his ordination to the priesthood, he was consecrated Bishop by Archbishop Purcell, and in 1875 was elevated to the Archbishopric of the new archdiocese of Philadelphia by His Holiness Pope Pius IX. of illustrious memory. In all these high and responsible positions of civil and religious life, Archbishop Wood ever commanded the respect and esteem of all classes, all sects and all parties by his unobtrusive qualities, his religious zeal and his great worth as a good citizen and a holy churchman. While indefatigable in his labors to advance the spiritual interests of his flock, he was ever anxious and ready to do anything that would ensure their social and temporal welfare. His Grace was a warm-hearted and generous friend to the poor and distressed; his last act was to inaugurate an Irish Relief Fund in the columns of the Catholic Standard for the starving poor in Ireland, and which resulted in the handsome sum of ten thousand dollars being sent to the Bishops of the impoverished districts. His good works are perpetuated in the establishment and founding of numerous churches, schools and charitable institutions in the City of Brotherly Love, which will remain intimately associated with the memory of his name, and which will tell more eloquently than pen or voice of the good and great Archbishop, whose loss the Catholic Church of America deploras today with the deepest feelings of regret.

THE ABOMINATIONS OF THE "PERSONAL COLUMN"

The "Personal Column" in journalism has developed into a most abominable institution. It has become the disgrace of the profession, as it has destroyed the peace of families and brought ruin to the morals and virtue of unsuspecting individuals. Emphatically testifying to the degradation of the small minority of the public press. The time however has come when the respectable class of journals should protest against the impurities of this journalistic innovation which has become with certain newspapers the foul mouthpiece of badly veiled prostitution. The people of New York, especially the mothers of families, aided by several organs of moral opinion, are actually engaged in waging an unrelenting war on the great unscrupulous daily of the metropolis, the N. Y. Herald. Public meetings have been called and held to organize a crusade against what is justly termed "the leprosy of the Personal Column." If James Gordon Bennett were not a man who does not hesitate to boast that he "lost his reputation long ago" he would of his own accord have abolished the infamous Personal Column. But as he is unwilling to do so the post active efforts have been put forth to root out the evil and cover up the stagnant pool of immorality. A prominent citizen, who lost the confidence of his wife and family by having his name wantonly dragged through the mire of this column in the Herald by some disreputable character, has just entered an action for \$100,000 damages against the proprietor of that paper. We, however, have not got to travel so far as New York for lessons of admonition against the unholiness of the Personal Column. In our own midst the evil is as rank as it ever was in the American metropolis. The following extract from an evening contemporary will speak for itself:— PERSONAL.—An American gentleman of good family, a stranger in Montreal, desires the acquaintance of a nice lady. Address: "Morrice,"—offices. The harm done by such filthy advertisements as the above, and which appear regularly in the same paper, is incalculable. Such open pandering to vice and profligacy is deserving of not only of the severest condemnation but of the punishment of the law. The Government of the country prohibits and punishes the publication and circulation of immoral literature; a fortiori, should it prohibit and punish a public invitation to an Assignment Bureau, for a newspaper office that will lend itself to such practices is nothing else. An American stranger in Montreal desires the acquaintance of a nice lady" and the desire of this sneak is carried into the home circles

of our respectable citizens, and is whispered into the ears of the unsuspecting and innocent youth. What would be the result of the meeting of this "stranger" and "a nice young lady" at the said office? It is needless to proceed further, the ruin of thousands of other "nice ladies" who were similarly trapped through this same personal column will suggest the answer to the question. The prosperity of such a paper is a startling commentary on the morality of the people of Montreal. And this is the paper that pushes its hypocrisy to such an extent as to lecture our citizens and especially the Irish people, on the necessity of virtue and morality, side by side with its "Personal Abominations." The community needs to be aroused on this subject and an earnest resolute effort to wipe out this degrading blot from journalism should be made by all those who take an interest in public morality and who desire to limit the occasions of danger to which the young and the old are exposed. In conclusion we will give the views of Mr. Obanancy M. Dewey on the subject, as delivered on Tuesday last before the N. Y. Press Association: "The newspaper is read by the boy before he begins the study of his morning's lessons and it is his companion after he returns from school. It is beside our daughter in her boudoir and her bedroom. It drops into those young lives facts, thoughts and impressions which bear sweet or bitter fruit in after years. You and I have known the whole moral nature of youth soiled and spoiled by this unguarded and ungovernable communion. It is often said that there is enormous profit in ministering to the depraved and debased elements in human nature, and that the papers which relate throw away fortunes. I do not believe it; if the paper has come to stay. Without the family support no newspaper can survive; and that journal will have the longest life, largest profits and the greatest influence which, as far as possible, admits to its columns only such matter as its editor would freely narrate at his own table."

THE ILLEGALITY OF THE EXHIBIT TAX

The Dominion Supreme Court has just rendered an important judgment in the case of MacLaren vs. the Quebec Provincial Government. The point at issue was the power of a Provincial Legislature to raise a revenue, by the imposition of a stamp tax, on receipts, notes, accounts and all other exhibits filed in courts of law. In 1876 an act was passed in the Local Legislature which required litigants to affix a ten cent stamp to each exhibit that they might file in court. The will of the Legislature was obeyed and no one took exception to the law until 1881, when Mr. MacLaren, Q. C., acting as counsel in a Superior Court case, tendered a note as an exhibit without the customary ten cent stamp being affixed. This was the beginning of the trouble. The prothonotaries refused to accept the exhibit without the stamp. Mr. MacLaren having resolved to test the validity of the law, moved for and obtained a rule against these officials, ordering them to appear before a judge and show cause why they refused to receive the unstamped exhibit. The Government at once saw the necessity of moving in the matter, as it involved the existence of one of their most useful sources of revenue, this exhibit tax bringing in between thirty and forty thousand dollars a year. The Attorney-General accordingly intervened in the case on the grounds that the law placed the administration of justice in the hands of the Provincial Government; that it must pay the salaries and fees of its officials, especially of those who receive and preserve exhibits filed in the courts of law; that Sec. 32 of Chap. 109, of the Consolidated Statutes of Lower Canada gives the Governor-in-Council the power to impose such tax or duty as, he sees fit on all proceedings in courts, and that the Act 39 Vic, Chap. 8, imposed a tax of 10 cents on each exhibit filed in cases. Mr. MacLaren on the other hand, maintained that these fees were used not to pay the officials but were used for general purposes; he however based his objection to the tax principally on the grounds that in attempting to levy and collect this tax the Government were seeking to raise a revenue for Provincial purposes by illegal means, viz, by indirect taxation, which is not within the powers of a Local Legislature. The British North America Act says on the subject, that "in each Province the Legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to direct taxation within the Province, in order to the raising of a revenue for Provincial purposes," while it confers on the Dominion Parliament the power to raise money "by any mode or system of taxation" that will not of course conflict with the exclusive power of the Local Parliaments to tax directly. The objection was well taken, and the Hon. Justice Mackay, before whom the case was heard, held the tax to be indirect and unconstitutional, and rendered judgment accordingly. The case was brought to the Court of Appeal by the Government, when they succeeded in having the decision reversed. Mr. MacLaren appealed the case to the Dominion Supreme Court which came back to this first judgment, declaring the exhibit tax illegal. The issue is of the greatest importance to the Local Government, and the dread of losing such a valuable source of revenue is displayed in their anxiety and haste to have the case appealed from to the Privy Council in England. We would like to know, in this connection, the use of a Dominion Supreme Court when its judgments are not final; its name is evidently a misnomer. The Government has instructed the Hon. Mr. Laocote to take all necessary proceedings for further

appeal and to make application to the Privy Council during its present sitting. Hon. Mr. Laocote points to be of the opinion that the question is not only a matter of the ten-cent stamp-exhibit, but that it may lead to a decision "that all stamps imposed since Confederation are illegal, and if it is decided that it is an indirect tax, and that the Province has no right to impose indirect taxes, then it has no right to impose indirect stamps; and in fact that any stamps imposed for new administrative purposes since Confederation are illegal."

It is, therefore, quite easy to understand why the Government is not satisfied with the decision of the highest tribunal in the country; no government likes to see its powers of taxation curtailed, especially when it is in want of all the revenue it can command, and more. In the meantime, it is a pity, if it be not a shame, to have our Governments and our Legislatures pass Acts which are so easily declared unconstitutional and ultra vires. A little more knowledge and understanding of the British North America Act by our legislators would prevent such expensive and troublesome litigation as in the case under discussion.

THE APPOINTMENT OF LANSDOWNE TO THE GOVERNOR-GENERALSHIP

The selection of Lord Lansdowne as successor to the Marquis of Lorne for the Governor-Generalship of Canada continues to be a prominent topic on both sides of the Atlantic. From the beginning it was felt that the appointment was an injudicious one and that it would be better if it never had been made. Great dissatisfaction and even indignation have been unequivocally expressed in many quarters at the idea of placing such a man as Lansdowne at the head of Canadian affairs, while, on the other hand, the felicitations that were uttered for the Downing street favor in certain other quarters were either the expression of flattery or ignorance. There can be no doubt that in the appointment of the Marquis of Lansdowne Gladstone has made a most unpopular and risky selection, and it is becoming more and more evident that it is looked upon with increasing disfavour by a very large number of our fellow citizens. The question will be asked: In what is the appointment of Lansdowne to the Governor-Generalship objectionable to the Canadian people? And we give the following answer: The appointment of Lansdowne is objectionable from a triple point of view; first, on account of the person selected; secondly, on account of the manner in which the appointment was made, and thirdly, on account of the reasons why it was made. In the first place, it is debasing nonsense for any one to hold or assert that it makes no difference what kind of man, or manner of man is sent to govern and rule over a free and self-respecting nation, as long as the British Government sends out some one who can feed on our best, and carry away his salary at the end of his term. It makes all the difference in the world, whether our governors (so long as we continue to import them) are men of honorable record and stainless character. Canadians would be unworthy of the name if they would consent to be ruled by a man whose record was a glaring contrast with freedom, justice and morality. And the antecedents of the Marquis of Lansdowne, are they such as to commend him to the people of Canada and to win for him that respect and submission necessary to the welfare and peaceful condition of the country? We say, decidedly not! Lansdowne's record is written on pages of blood and death. He is greatly responsible for the terrible sufferings and starvation of fellow subjects in another portion of the Empire. The Chicago Tribune, one of the most influential and enlightened organs of public opinion across the line, has the following to say in regard to his conduct: "His pauperized tenants have been forced to emigrate in large numbers, and in such a pitiable condition that many of them have died in American workhouses. He seems to have improved upon the ordinary methods of protraction practised by landlords. His evictions have been characterized by extreme cruelty. He has never carried out the provisions of the Land Bill when he could avoid it, and he is even charged with misappropriating relief funds to the improvement of his property. He has lived a life of ease and luxury in England and on the Continent, which was made possible by the harlot, the inadequate compensation, the brutal treatment and the grinding down and pauperizing of his wretched tenantry." In view of these odious antecedents, and of the utter indifference of Downing street to the kind of man that is sent to rule over this country, we cannot but consider the appointment of Lansdowne to be highly imprudent, and one that will fall to meet with the approval of the entire Canadian people. A Governor that the people cannot and will not respect, and a people that the Governor cannot and dare not trust, will be a novel position for Canada to be in during the next term. Is it wise to force these unpleasant relations upon us? Let our Canadian and Home Governments put their heads together and consider the question.

THE BELMONT LABEL SUIT.

When John Devoy, the editor of the Irish Nation, undertook to force August Belmont, the New York banker, to pay back a large amount of money subscribed for the Irish cause in 1865, and dishonestly withheld by the said banker, he undertook a task that was as difficult as it was worthy. He had to fight a man with twenty millions and face an influence, political and social, which was paramount in the State. For eighteen years August Belmont refused to return the sum of \$16,000 which had been entrusted to him in his capacity as banker by O'Mahony to be paid to O'Leary in London. That money had never been paid to O'Leary, and when a demand was made for its return by O'Mahony the house of Belmont interposed the most dishonest objections and inaugurated a litigation which was never concluded, and was only abandoned when O'Mahony sank into his grave. For several years there was no one with pluck enough to tackle the great millionaire and to force him to disgorge the money to which he had not the slightest right; it was felt that against any one who would attempt such a thing would be arrayed the millions and influence of Belmont; the leaders of the dominant political party of which he was the chief, the whole official staff of the departments, the judiciary, and the party press. And such are actually the odds against John Devoy, he has had to fight in his worthy attempt to recover a substantial portion of the national funds. Belmont brought an action for "criminal libel," but failed to secure a verdict of guilty against Devoy. A second trial was instituted without much delay, and every precaution was taken to prevent a second disagreement of the jury. The case was carefully selected from a class that have smacked for such a Belmont whether in the right or wrong;

such marked contempt by the Downing street officials. If our Ministers and popular representatives had the slightest respect for their position and the standing of the Dominion, they would send home an emphatic protest against such haughty and impetuous airs by Mr. Gladstone and his government. If we have no direct voice in the appointment of a Governor-General, that is no reason why our people should be annoyed so openly, in the British Parliament and told to mind our own business and take what we get, as the London Times unseemingly remarked. We hold that it would behoove the home authorities to have ascertained in some fashion, official or unofficial, from the responsible government of this country, whether such and such a personage would be acceptable to the Canadian people. If that course had been pursued, it is not probable that the same unpleasantness would exist as does now over the foisting of Lansdowne upon the Dominion. Finally, the appointment of this noble lord is objectionable, for the reasons which inspired it. The English press plainly confesses that it is regarded by the English Premier as a sort of rebuke or protest against the Home Bill resolutions transmitted to him from the Dominion Parliament a year ago. The London Morning Post says, in speaking of Lansdowne's opposition to the Land Bill, that his action in this matter "justifies the conclusion that when exercising viceregal sway in our North American dominions he will not permit himself to be made the tool of faction."

This is very complimentary to Lord Lorne who had the "weakness" to forward Canada's sympathy for Ireland to the foot of the throne. So we are promised that the next Governor "will not be made the tool of faction." But how will it be if Sir John A. Macdowell will undertake to run the Government without his Lordship's concurrence. The London Globe next discloses another reason why this particular individual was appointed. It says that with Lansdowne, "Annexation intrigues can, perhaps, be more effectually combated at Government House than in the Parliament at Ottawa." Then we are to have a Governor who will dictate the politics of the country, and crush out the aspirations of the people. The Viceregal Lodge is to be set up against the Senate and the House of Commons, and the business of the Governor will be to combat any demands for independence. The London Times caps the climax by declaring that Lansdowne's mission to Canada will be that of an agent of wholesale emigration from Ireland. Says the Times: "The great success of well managed schemes undertaken by private hands, like that which bears the name of Mr. Tuke, is a strong argument in favor of some larger and more fully organized attempt to relieve the poorest districts of Ireland. We may be sure that this matter will be one of the first to occupy Lord Lansdowne's attention; and, indeed, it is one which, from the Irish point of view, he has already studied in detail. It will be a satisfaction to Lord Lansdowne if he is permitted to aid in the solution of the well nigh insoluble Irish problem." So we are to have a Governor-General in the novel capacity of wholesale emigration agent. He will assist in depopulating not only his own estates in Kerry, but all the landlord-ridden districts of Ireland.

We think it is very unadvisable for Lansdowne to bring his landlord policy out to Canada. If the landlords want an emigration agent out here let them pay for one, but let not the Governor's salary be used for that purpose. On the whole, therefore, the appointment of Lansdowne to the Governor-Generalship of Canada must be considered a lamentable blunder on the part of the English Government, as it fails to give satisfaction and to meet with the approval of those over whom he will be sent to rule.