

MR. MERCIER, we are told, "is prepared to pass an orthodox school law—that is, one approved by the bishops of the Province, for we can do nothing without them just now—but later on, when we get the masses educated enough to realize the advantages of lay teaching, then we can do better still." Just so. Mr. Mercier has evidently taken to heart the wisdom of the prudent mother who advised her son not to go into the water until he had learned to swim.

THE question of State education, and of Common and Separate Schools, of which we heard so much during the late provincial contest, is now being put on one side as troublesome. This may suit the play of the party hacks on both sides, but it will not suit the people. It is an awkward matter, and the longer it is shuffled with the worse it will become. We can see but one possible solution of the difficulty. We must establish State secular schools, and the Separate Schools must go. That is to say, to the levying of the education rate there must be no exceptions. If any sect wants schools apart, they should be allowed only on two conditions:—(1) That they be supported entirely by those who asked for them; and (2) That the education given be well up to the average of the Common Schools. We should not then hear of much demand for Separate Schools. Rate-supported schools for Catholics were a compromise, and, like most compromises, a mistake; because if they have them we cannot justly refuse them to any other religious body which becomes numerous enough to make the claim. Public opinion may not yet be ready for such a change; but if the attention of candidates is now called to the education difficulty, it is to be hoped that some among the number will have the pluck to try and ripen opinion among their constituents.

ENGLISHMEN who have paid a brief visit to this continent are very apt to go home and complain that English matters are generally misunderstood out here. There is some truth in this, but there is also fair excuse for such misunderstanding. Thus, it certainly does appear strange to us on this side of the Atlantic that just now, for example, while the political leaders of the nation are stirred to their nethermost depths, the society leaders are all in one form or another figuring in the Divorce Court. The Dilke case was bad, and the Campbell case was if possible worse. Now we are threatened with a batch of aristocratic divorce suits, and we are told that for intensity of interest and piquancy of detail the unsavoury reputations of Dilke and Campbell will be left in the shade. One lady, "a society belle," appears with twelve respondents. It is to be hoped that we shall be spared the details, especially in the full flavour of their piquancy. Several American papers have lately earned honourable mention for refusing to soil their pages by printing these details. This is better than having several columns of the offensive matter sent through by cable, and as an antidote, a moral editorial to say how shocking it all is. Some

Canadian papers might in the future act on the hint here conveyed. It however rests very much with the public, as editors, all the world over, will cater to the public taste.

THE explanation of Lord Randolph Churchill has fallen very flat. The course he has pursued is generally condemned by his friends, but considered praiseworthy by his opponents—a very dubious compliment. He has acted from pique, justifiable enough, possibly, from the kind of opposition he has met with from the ultra Conservatives in the Cabinet, yet much to be regretted from a public point of view. His late action is to be regretted, because it will for some time mar his usefulness. In view of the condition of things on the European Continent the Marquis of Salisbury cannot be blamed for not reducing the army and navy estimates. Of much more importance than the paring off of an odd million or so in the estimates is the question of efficiency, which is in truth the real economy. It is so in the small affairs of ordinary life, but especially so in matters of great public import. Lord Randolph's course has caused excitement in the various branches of the civil service, but economic spasms are frequent in England, and seldom result in much reform. His lordship has undoubtedly for the time impaired his usefulness, and rudely checked the onward course of a promising career.

RANTING for the plaudits of the gallery is a trick well known on the stage, and raving on the platform to secure the popular vote is an old expedient of the average American politician. Some of our neighbours across the line are just now very angry, and, as far as they are able, have already declared war and shed much blood. The only thing to be regretted is that occasionally this hysteric shrieking is heard abroad, and is sometimes mistaken for American opinion. Hence has arisen the idea one so often hears expressed in England that with the Yankees it is in all matters a case of "win, tin, or wrangle." The present cry for our fish or our blood will be pointed to as confirming the idea. But whatever the language of the press or the platform may be, the language of diplomacy is essentially courteous, and we may safely infer that when Minister Phelps calls on the Marquis of Salisbury, those gentlemen neither commence nor close the conference by shaking their fists in one another's faces. Let tuft-hunting congressmen and senators squall ever so loudly, the present dispute will of course be amicably settled, and Canadians, by acting with firmness and dignity, will preserve their rights and hold their own. We can also set an example of calmness in the matter. We need not use jeers and jibes ourselves, nor encourage their use in others; but we can all so act that we may, in the eloquent words of John Bright—used many years ago during a much more serious crisis—"do all that lies in our power to promote generous thoughts and generous words and generous deeds between two great nations, both speaking the English language, and both entitled, from a common origin, to lay claim to the English name."