

The Catholic Record Published Weekly at 28 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

General Agents: Messrs. Donat Crowe and Luke King. Ottawa Agency: P. J. Coffey, Gen'l Agent, 74 George St.

Catholic Record. LONDON, SATURDAY, FEB. 6, 1886.

- CALENDAR FOR FEBRUARY. 1. St. Blaise, Bishop and Martyr. 2. Purification of the B. V. M. Candlemas Day.



DIOCESE OF LONDON.

CIRCULAR LETTER OF HIS LORDSHIP THE BISHOP OF LONDON, TO THE CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE.

St. Peter's Palace, London, January 25th, 1886. REV. AND DEAR FATHERS,—We herewith send you an approved English translation of the Faculty Letter of Our Holy Father, proclaiming an extraordinary jubilee for this current year.

You will please read it to your flock on the first Sunday after its reception, and you will do well in this connection to explain the great spiritual advantages of a jubilee and the duty of your people to profit by them.

It would be most advisable and profitable to hold in each parish religious exercises during several days as a preparation for the worthy reception of the sacraments and the due performance of the conditions of the jubilee, and we require of the pastors of missions to carry out our views in this respect.

1st. The worthy reception of the Sacraments of Penance, and of the Blessed Eucharist. Observe that one confession and one communion will not suffice to fulfil the papal precept, and gain the Jubilee. But one confession and two communions will be sufficient for both purposes in the case of those who have already complied with the precept of annual confession or who will do so within the year.

2d. Strict fast on two days on which otherwise such a fast is not enjoined by the law or precept of the Church. The fast excludes the use of flesh meat, eggs, milk, butter and cheese, and permits only one full meal and a collation. The black day of the Jubilee may be made during Lent in this Diocese, as the faithful are allowed the use of eggs and of milk, butter, cheese, etc., in the Lenten season.

3d. Six visits to the Parish or District Church, with at least a short space of time between each visit. In London three visits shall be made to the Cathedral and St. Mary's Church, respectively. During these visits the faithful are to pray according to the intention of the Holy Father for the extirpation of heresies, the conversion of the erring, and for peace and good will amongst Christian rulers and peoples.

preparation for gaining the indulgence of the Jubilee. Each family in the Diocese could and should give as an average at least fifty cents for this holy and necessary object. If the faithful be generous with their alms for the purpose indicated, it will not be necessary for us to order a Diocesan collection therefor during the year, but otherwise we shall be compelled to do so in order to meet our obligations to the Seminary.

5th. In the case of regulars of either sex, and even in the case of persons belonging to enclosed orders, and also in the case of all others, whether ecclesiastical or lay, who are prevented either because they are in prison, or through infirmity, or any other good reason, from fulfilling the above conditions, or some of them, the confessor, has power to commute for other pious works, and also has power to dispense from communion children who have not yet made their first Communion.

The Jubilee may be gained as far as the indulgence is concerned as often as the prescribed works are repeated, but the special faculties given for absolution from censures, reserve cases, dispensations, etc., can be used only once.

Most earnestly commending the work of this Jubilee to your pastoral zeal and your priestly piety and charity. I remain, Rev. and Dear Fathers, your devoted and faithful servant in Christ, J. JOHN WALSH, Bishop of London.

THE ORANGE "TWO HUNDRED" VERSUS THE LORD BISHOP OF KINGSTON.

Our "loyal" brethren are not always consistent. They oppose their Catholic fellow-citizens in every movement that is directed to the remedy of religious or social grievances resulting from the penal laws of by-gone times or the hereditary intolerance of anti-Catholic bigotry. They meet in lodges and pass hostile resolutions, which they flaunt in the face of their peace loving neighbors, and with clamour and swagger they challenge Catholics to the fight. But when they get the slightest taste of what they richly deserve, they take their punishment badly, and, piping the tune of wail and woe, they proclaim to all mankind how sore they feel. A few weeks ago they would not allow the Irish population of Kingston to meet quietly in the exercise of their right as citizens, and arrange for the sending of a small measure of help to struggling friends in the old country for the more secure passage of a necessary Relief Bill through the British Legislature, without stepping upon the platform and audaciously denouncing this most legitimate proceeding as "irresponsible."

They met in their purpose of creating disorder and provoking a quarrel, they made a two weeks' circuit through the city and by "consulting and canvassing and coaxing and pressuring" as the Lord Bishop of Kingston forcibly and accurately wrote, as well as by other less legitimate methods, they procured a decent show of names to an artfully concocted advertisement by which several honest men were entrapped into signature, and forthwith they convoked an anti-Home Rule meeting. With their wonted ferocity they thundered against Irishmen and Catholics, Popes and Bishops, in atrocious declamation from the platform and supplementary tirades through the Press. No language of condemnation was deemed too harsh. The highest guiltiness known to the law was freely imputed. And all this because of Irish encouragement being given to an Irish petition for presentation to the Queen, Lords and Commons of the realm by the most loyal of Her Majesty's subjects. But now, when the Bishop of Kingston calmly reviews the situation, and proceeds to weigh the arguments of the Orange orators and count the "gentlemen of education" and recognized public merit" who took the place of prominence on the platform as ardent sympathizers with Ireland's enemies, and carefully ascertains through watchful eye-witnesses that a "large proportion of Protestant gentlemen" in the body of the hall "abstained ostentatiously from any visible signifying approval" of the sentiments uttered by the orators, lo! the sucking-loves of civil and religious liberty are stirred with wrath and indignation, and they tell us, through one of the Kingston papers, that indeed they are "quite excited" and there is a "great furore in the city; and the feeling (that is the Grit editor's suggested feeling) is spreading, that a public meeting should be called in order to repudiate His Lordship's letter and denounce the writer of it." Isn't that funny! *Quis taliter Graecos de solitione querentis!*

We see no necessity whatever for justifying His Lordship's position. Probably he is of like opinion himself. The words of his letter to the Lord Mayor of Dublin have been evidently well considered, and, to speak the plain truth, they must appear to minds untrammelled by Orange bigotry and rightly acquainted with the facts of the case to be rather a moderate expression of the judgment of impartial men, which he was called upon to voice and to emphasize with the high sanction of his name. We don't care to recall the foul aspersions and bad language of some of the reverend and irreverend orators at the anti-Home Rule meeting;

nor the slanderous misrepresentations that followed, as an appendix to the vocal performance of the Orange comedians, in the shape of anonymous exhibits in the local daily papers; nor could we think of defiling our pages with the revolting blasphemies printed and published over the name of an ultra-Orange ex-reverend maligner of our holy religion, whose silence on the anti-Home Rule platform was an enigma to all Kingston until he had vomited his columnful of impiety and fetid bile at the office-door of one of the local dailies—the one whose editor, infected by the poisonous exhalations of his visitor, is now panting with what he calls "furore," for an indignation-meeting to denounce a beloved Bishop in his own Episcopal city under the very eyes of five thousand of his devoted subjects. At the same time we confess that those innocent revilers of everything Irish and Catholic can hardly be blamed for feeling awfully chagrined at the Bishop's brief and cutting criticism upon their proceedings. He gave them indeed a hard nut to crack, harder still to digest, and it is the opinion of the medical faculty that the Orange stomach is at present in a dyspeptic condition.

It was cruelly on the part of His Lordship to insist on their swallowing that heartlessly condensed summary of judgment, "They failed to adduce even one argument deserving the attention of thinking men." What a pity the suggestion of the extremely consistent editor of the local daily that advocated an indignation meeting, has not been adopted. Universal curiosity would have been concentrated upon the personality of that meeting. Perhaps the editor himself, being a distinguished proselyte, might have been found doing it thoroughly on the platform and denouncing the Bishop of Kingston with new born zeal for the "great, glorious and immortal." As for ourselves, being of an analytic turn of mind, we should have watched with exceeding great interest the logical accuracy of reasoning, with which the speakers would have laid down their big pregnant principles and adroitly applied them to modern historical facts of Kingstonian interest, and drawn out in conclusive form the exact contradictory of His Lordship's simple, matter-of-fact thesis. We presume they would have followed the syllogistic style as the most scientific and trenchant method of cornering Bishops. Their dialectic process would have found exceptional facility of displaying itself in holding up to view the argumentative scales, and defining the number of literary and logical drachms and scruples that determines the precise weight of each Orange argument against the justice of conceding Home Rule to Ireland. We verily doubt whether even the learned Q. C. himself, who "speaks Anglo-Saxon" as becomes an antiquarian, would have succeeded in demonstrating the dialectic force of his loosely strung clippings from Yankee village newspapers, as forensic evidence of the capital crime of treason against Mr. Parnell and his co-conspirators of Kingston. We have heard a very humble man remark upon the extremely unprofessional neglect of the lawyer to establish the authenticity of that bundle of newspaper rags, so solemnly summoned from out his breeches' pockets, as Mr. Parnell's actual statements, truly and fully set forth by the ragaries of conflicting reporters, without omission or curtailment of context, exaggeration of style or crafty interpolation. We will keep our eye upon the Q. C. in his future pleadings before the criminal court, and we think his clients will likewise have need to watch him closely.

A more grievous complaint has been made in a letter written by the brains-carriers of the L. O. L. and published in a local daily over the imposing name of a certain eminent Navy captain, to wit, that the Bishop of Kingston, having carefully adjusted his binocular, did scan the platform of the Orange meeting with searching eyes and counted only six—yes, "not as many as six gentlemen of education and recognized public merit" in the vicinity of the chair. Well, to avoid confounding the certain with the uncertain, we must observe how very definitely His Lordship fixes the just number. Had he said "half-a-dozen," the phrase would sound too elastic. But here we have the arithmetical six. It may be assumed that the Bishop's eye rested with more or less complacency upon five of the gentlemen who formed the chairman's body guard. Now, let the sixth be produced. He is the gentleman whose identity is affirmed by the L. O. L., and is denied by the Bishop. The subject is critical, and a little caution is required in the handling of it, likewise some practical skill in the diagnosis of character. Let the gentleman be turned face-wise and side-wise; let him be weighed and measured, and scrutinized inwardly and outwardly, up and down, and let the microscope be scientifically applied for the discovery of the three attributes specified in His Lordship's letter. 1st. He must be a "gentleman." Let us here have an accurate definition, for with this, says Aristotle, all argument should

begin. Should our Loyal Brethren indulge in any looseness or redundancy of terms, we will dispute their definition, and then will come "the tug of war." Let them remember that their "gentleman" and his definition must be mutually convertible. We will accept no shams. The cut of his coat will not serve for a patent of true nobility. 2nd. He must be a gentleman "of education." We know that there are not very many in the Lodge to whom this designation could truthfully be applied. The gentleman, however, whose identity is the subject of inquiry, is not supposed to be an Orangeman, but only one of the sympathizers with Orangism on the platform of the anti-Irish meeting. Well, let the case proceed. There are educated and uneducated gentlemen. A man may be a most worthy citizen, entitled to respect for his moral virtues, domestic and social, for his industry and skill in trade, his fidelity to all his duties and his success in making money, and withal he may not be a "gentleman of education." It may be, too, that he takes part in the public affairs of the city, and is an active and efficient agitator in municipal and parliamentary politics, and in sundry other ways attracts the attention of his neighbors, and still he may not count, nor claim to count, amongst the select class known as "gentlemen of education." Assuredly the Loyal association whose foremost orator fascinates a public assembly with the classic elegance of such phrases as "him and me was on the same platform," must be eminently qualified to test the superior character of the mental culture, the ennobling gifts of genius and the varied scientific, literary and aesthetic acquirements that distinguish their sixth friend and assure his position as a "gentleman of education." In all fraternity of spirit we ask them to produce the "sixth gentleman" that graced their platform at the anti Irish meeting, and let all the scholarly experts of Kingston, including, of course, the learned professors of Queen's, be summoned as a jury, and let an unbiased judge be appointed to hear and determine this all momentous question concerning the educational status of the individual whose identity is in dispute. Nothing short of this will satisfy the public mind. The issue is a rigid test demanded by His Lordship. It means merit, public merit, recognized public merit. How did His Lordship think of so exactly gaging his man! He must have eyes like a lynx. Here again we insist that our Loyal Brethren, should they undertake to prove his identity, shall start from definitions. What is "merit" in a citizen? And what constitutes "public merit"? They may imagine that the beauty of the yellow lily reflected from the countenance of a Brother, as he stands behind the footlights of a Loyal platform in grand rhetorical attitude, and holds aloft the sword of Gideon amidst the rapturous applause of the auditory, is an all sufficient proof of "recognized public merit." But, as in the matter of education, so also in regard of public merit, the intense agitation of men's minds shall not be calmed except by the honest verdict of an impartial and universally respected tribunal. The mayor and aldermen and the whole body of our municipal councillors have a right to sit on the bench in the trial of this supreme issue, which is to dissipate forever the imaginary claims of several worthy citizens who now bask in the sunshine of "self-constituted public merit." We eagerly await the dawning of the new edge of Light when the sun of knowledge shall spread his luminous rays, without intermission of night, over the lovely city of Kingston, and Orange nebulousity being dispelled, each man shall see for himself on all occasions and discern at a glance whether his neighbour be in reality a "gentleman"—"of education"—and "recognized public merit." This is the happy result sure to come of the inquest upon the sixth gentleman, who sate amongst the Orangemen on the platform of the anti-Irish meeting in the city hall a few weeks ago.

Among the gentlemen lately called to the Bar of Ontario is Mr. F. R. Latchford, of Ottawa. We congratulate Mr. Latchford on his success and the Bar of Ontario on its acquisition of a gentleman of such ability and promise. Our young friend is blessed, not alone with much talent, but with that industry and good judgment without which the highest gifts are unprofitable alike to their possessors and to society at large;

begin. Should our Loyal Brethren indulge in any looseness or redundancy of terms, we will dispute their definition, and then will come "the tug of war." Let them remember that their "gentleman" and his definition must be mutually convertible. We will accept no shams. The cut of his coat will not serve for a patent of true nobility. 2nd. He must be a gentleman "of education." We know that there are not very many in the Lodge to whom this designation could truthfully be applied. The gentleman, however, whose identity is the subject of inquiry, is not supposed to be an Orangeman, but only one of the sympathizers with Orangism on the platform of the anti-Irish meeting. Well, let the case proceed. There are educated and uneducated gentlemen. A man may be a most worthy citizen, entitled to respect for his moral virtues, domestic and social, for his industry and skill in trade, his fidelity to all his duties and his success in making money, and withal he may not be a "gentleman of education." It may be, too, that he takes part in the public affairs of the city, and is an active and efficient agitator in municipal and parliamentary politics, and in sundry other ways attracts the attention of his neighbors, and still he may not count, nor claim to count, amongst the select class known as "gentlemen of education." Assuredly the Loyal association whose foremost orator fascinates a public assembly with the classic elegance of such phrases as "him and me was on the same platform," must be eminently qualified to test the superior character of the mental culture, the ennobling gifts of genius and the varied scientific, literary and aesthetic acquirements that distinguish their sixth friend and assure his position as a "gentleman of education." In all fraternity of spirit we ask them to produce the "sixth gentleman" that graced their platform at the anti Irish meeting, and let all the scholarly experts of Kingston, including, of course, the learned professors of Queen's, be summoned as a jury, and let an unbiased judge be appointed to hear and determine this all momentous question concerning the educational status of the individual whose identity is in dispute. Nothing short of this will satisfy the public mind. The issue is a rigid test demanded by His Lordship. It means merit, public merit, recognized public merit. How did His Lordship think of so exactly gaging his man! He must have eyes like a lynx. Here again we insist that our Loyal Brethren, should they undertake to prove his identity, shall start from definitions. What is "merit" in a citizen? And what constitutes "public merit"? They may imagine that the beauty of the yellow lily reflected from the countenance of a Brother, as he stands behind the footlights of a Loyal platform in grand rhetorical attitude, and holds aloft the sword of Gideon amidst the rapturous applause of the auditory, is an all sufficient proof of "recognized public merit." But, as in the matter of education, so also in regard of public merit, the intense agitation of men's minds shall not be calmed except by the honest verdict of an impartial and universally respected tribunal. The mayor and aldermen and the whole body of our municipal councillors have a right to sit on the bench in the trial of this supreme issue, which is to dissipate forever the imaginary claims of several worthy citizens who now bask in the sunshine of "self-constituted public merit." We eagerly await the dawning of the new edge of Light when the sun of knowledge shall spread his luminous rays, without intermission of night, over the lovely city of Kingston, and Orange nebulousity being dispelled, each man shall see for himself on all occasions and discern at a glance whether his neighbour be in reality a "gentleman"—"of education"—and "recognized public merit." This is the happy result sure to come of the inquest upon the sixth gentleman, who sate amongst the Orangemen on the platform of the anti-Irish meeting in the city hall a few weeks ago.

RECIPROCITY. We are more than pleased to note that the St. Paul Pioneer Press, one of the ablest and most influential journals published in the American North West, takes strong ground in favor of reciprocity with Canada. Our contemporary says it is time that the trade relations between the two countries were established on a broad and reasonable basis, and that the fisheries question affords an excellent opportunity for entering upon a period of reciprocity. Something must be done without delay to settle imminent disputes on this question of the fisheries. For the last six months American fishermen have plied their trade in Canadian waters only on sufferance—by virtue of the agreement concluded between the governments of the United States and Great Britain. This truce was agreed upon only till such time as Congress could consider the matter. Congress has now been for two months in session, and the people of Canada are naturally growing impatient. They have had the bad end of the bargain, for, as matters now stand, all their claims are waived. While Americans may fish in Canadian waters without hindrance and without compensation, Canadian fishermen cannot dispose of their catch in the markets of the United States without payment of duties in full. Stranger still, the New England fishermen, not satisfied with this advantage, clamor for more protection and a more liberal treatment of Canada.

The Pioneer Press goes on to argue that freedom of trade between Canada and the United States is both natural and desirable. "We are, geographically, one nation. No state needs protection against the Dominion any more than it needs it against another state. Every argument points to a closer connection for the future between the peoples of one race, inhabiting countries divided only by an arbitrary line." Our North western contemporary concludes:—"The strength and continental supremacy of the United States cannot be better advanced than by liberal reciprocity treaties with the peoples of Canada and Mexico. If this congress, like the last, finds its hands tied, as far as any rational reform of the tariff is concerned, it may yet do a great good by assisting to carry out a great American idea. The Mexican treaty still remains inoperative until the House shall appropriate the money necessary to carry it out. For a somewhat similar treaty, covering at least staples of commerce with Canada, there is ample room. For such an arrangement Canada herself is eager. The revenue reformers of the House will do the country a service second only to the accomplishment of tariff revision if they shall concentrate their forces upon an effort to establish liberal trade reciprocity with our nearest neighbors." While it is gratifying to notice such a sound and friendly expression of view in the North West, it is, if possible, more so to perceive indications of a like friendliness and good sense in that citadel of protection and exclusive trade, Philadelphia. The American of that city takes very decided ground in favor of a renewal of amicable trade relations with Canada. In its issue of the 16th of January that journal strongly argued in favor of closer commercial relations with this Dominion, and in that of the 23rd of the same month, we find the following very marked declaration of amity towards Canada:—"Mr. Towns, of Illinois, who for some time past has been giving the need of a Zollverein for the whole continent, sees no good reason for a special agreement with Canada, and is in the dark as to the reasons for an especially close sympathy with our neighbors of the South. We think that a little reflection on his part would satisfy him on that point. We presume that even the friends of the larger proposal will admit there is a difference between the public and political morality of the Canadians and that of the Latin states of this continent. An arrangement with Canada would be as binding on her part as on ours. Her people have a well settled order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican railroads under the guarantees of that republic. What they promise us they will do as faithfully as we will do what we promise them. What our neighbors on the South promise us will be done as long as it suits them better to keep on their order of government; they have high ideas of the duty of public honesty. These two points are enough to mark the difference. The Canadians, for instance, are incapable of treating any foreign investor as the Mexican government has treated the Americans who recently invested their capital in Mexican