

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT 400 RICHMOND ST. LONDON, ONTARIO.

EDITOR: REV. GEO. B. NORTHBRAVES, Author of "Missions of Modern Ireland."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor.

GENERAL AGENTS: Messrs. Donist Crowe and Luke King, Agents for St. John's, Nicholas Doyle, OTTAWA AGENCY: P. J. Coffey, General Agent, 74 George St.

REVENUE: Five Copies, 50 Cts. Ten Copies, \$1.00. Payable in every case in advance.

Advertisements: - Ten cents per line each insertion.

Approved by the Bishop of London, and recommended by the Archbishop of St. Michael's, the Bishops of Ottawa, Hamilton, Kingston, and Peterboro, and leading Catholic Clergymen throughout the Dominion.

All correspondence addressed to the Publisher will receive prompt attention.

Articles must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

Persons writing for a change of address should invariably send to the name of their former post office.

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., Nov. 5th, 1887.

TO OUR READERS.

The management of the CATHOLIC RECORD entreat attention to day to a communication which will at once interest and distress our readers. They will perceive that the Rev. Father Coffey, in execution of a long-entertained and not infrequently expressed desire, withdraws from editorial connection with the CATHOLIC RECORD. No one acquainted with the varied, extensive, and laudable character of his journalistic labors, especially for the past nine years, will feel surprised at this determination, or grudge him a season of change, if that, indeed, can be called a season of change, which will, we may be permitted to believe, be devoted at least in part to more enduring literary labors in the sacred cause of truth. With the CATHOLIC RECORD Father Coffey's name and labors and talents have been almost from its very inception honorably identified. Often, indeed, during the past few years did he express a desire for release from editorial care, but as often did he generously withdraw it, out of consideration for the best interests of the paper. In the early days of the RECORD, in days of hard struggle and severe trial, inseparable from the beginning of such an undertaking, his disinterested services and almost incredible labors placed the paper and its management under everlasting obligations. We beg leave to outjoin Father Coffey's letter:

Thomas Coffey, Esq., Publisher and Proprietor of the Catholic Record, London, Ont.

DEAR SIR,—Auspicious circumstances enable, and a deep sense of duty bid me tender renewed expression of a desire often verbally conveyed since my formal announcement thereof by letter in the fall of 1883 and the winter of 1884, viz., that of severing my editorial connection with the CATHOLIC RECORD. It was with great hesitation and no little reluctance—it was, as you remember, in obedience to urgent, weighty and repeated representations that my editorial contributions could be of service to the consolidation of its material interests, through the hoped for consequent enlargement of its usefulness and diffusion of its circulation, that I began in 1879 to render the less immediate, and in 1882 the more continuous and unbroken assistance which limited gifts and feeble talents permitted.

Did I any longer feel that this assistance were required in the furtherance of the RECORD's interests, it should continue at your disposal, in so far as a necessarily lessened strength and overtaxed energies could allow. The knowledge, however, that the CATHOLIC RECORD has passed the critical period of its existence, the conviction that it now rests on solid foundations, the belief that its future is assured, in fine, the honest feeling that I have done by it every duty which conscience dictated, and rendered every service which friendship commended, impel me now to faithfully to renew the expression of my oft-repeated desire of relinquishing a responsibility to me particularly burdensome.

I am not undervaluing in the discharge of my editorial functions I may have employed expressions, followed courses, advocated causes and policies which did not find favor with men of greater merit, higher gifts and wider experience, nor yet am I forgetful of the continuous attention lavished on me in season and out of season by that industrious class of persons who know better than the editor how to edit a paper.

But whatever my errors of judgment—however regardless I may have been of the suggestions tendered by the sapient class just alluded to, I can at this moment fearlessly assert that never did I fall when duty commanded to bow my will to the better judgment of others, never did I do wilful injustice to any man, never, no matter how severe my expressions, did I knowingly permit rancor to assail character or destroy reputation, never, in fine, did I express sentiments unprovoked by conviction or unprovoked by conscience. Not only have I had the gratification of duty done as my sense of right dictated, but the satisfaction, and no small one it is, of the active sympathy and unfailing sustenance of multitudes of readers throughout the Dominion, who through good and evil report as generously stood by the CATHOLIC RECORD. To His Lordship the Bishop and clergy of London, to the other prelates and priests of the Province, and to many warm personal friends among the laity throughout the Dominion, especially the good Oblate Fathers of Mary Immaculate, my old preceptors and life long friends, I feel it a duty to express lasting gratitude for much good counsel and unceasing encouragement during my nine years' editorial connection with the CATHOLIC RECORD.

This connection, as I have stated, as before stated, enable me now of my own motion to cheerfully sever, with naught of malice to any, with earnest good will to all.

That the CATHOLIC RECORD may meet with unbounded success, and that its faithful readers may be for its readers, patrons and friends, and even for those who differ from its views and oppose its purposes, a season of peace, plenty and prosperity, is the earnest hope of one who thus cheerfully releases himself from the cares, burdens and anxieties of editorial responsibility.

I cannot close without an expression of a hearty feeling of gratitude to my fellow journalists of the Province for generally courteous and kindly treatment—even in circumstances where their sense of right led them to condemnation of my views. I feel safe in stating, writing with knowledge of what I say, that no country in the world is possessed of so able, more patriotic and more honorable body of citizens than is Ontario in her journalists. And I may be permitted to add that my retirement from the responsible editorship of the CATHOLIC RECORD, if not likely to actually abridge or diminish my literary or journalistic labors, will release me from a responsibility which, it is no secret, I have long since desired to renounce, and from burdens that were for me too oppressive. I do not, indeed, by any means, purpose a final abandonment of the press. With returned strength and increased activity, I trust that, God will aid and helping, my pen will be ever ready for vigorous assertion and defence of the principles, convictions and sentiments, which, during seventeen years' connection with the press of Canada, I have unwaveringly propounded, advocated and upheld, and that whether in wider or more limited spheres of usefulness, I may be enabled to bear my due share of the burdens and heats of the day in the battles of the future.

I have the honor to be, sir, Very faithfully yours, JOHN F. COFFEY

In acquiescing in Father Coffey's final resolve, the management of the RECORD feels its keen sense of loss—a loss that, however, it is alleviated as is our grief assuaged by the hope that though he retires from the active and trying sphere of responsible editorship his facile pen will during leisure moments still do valued service in the cause of right. Father Coffey carries with him the hearty good wishes and the inexpressible gratitude of the readers, friends and patrons of the CATHOLIC RECORD in every portion of the Dominion. He has well earned their gratitude, and to him we tender it on their behalf, together with the assurance that their best prayers and good wishes follow him in his return to the active exercise of the Catholic ministry.

TO THE READERS OF THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

DEAR FRIENDS,—Owing to the severance of the Rev. Dr. Coffey's connection with the CATHOLIC RECORD, the charge of the Editorial Department of this journal will henceforth devolve upon me. The ability and devotedness to Catholic interests which have been characteristic of the RECORD while under the editorial control of Rev. Dr. Coffey, have raised it to a high position among the Catholic journals of this continent, and rendered it a welcome visitor at thousands of Catholic firesides, and have, at the same time, made it difficult for the Rev. Doctor's successor to satisfy the expectations of its readers, who will naturally wish to see it retain its high rank among the journals of the day. I can only say, that having been an occasional contributor to its columns in the past, I will endeavor in the future, to the best of my ability, to fulfil the objects for which the CATHOLIC RECORD was established, namely, the advancement of our holy faith, and the advocacy of Catholic interests generally.

Yours respectfully in Christ, GEORGE B. NORTHBRAVES, Priest, Editor of the CATHOLIC RECORD.

THE LANGUAGE QUESTION.

While the Mail is copying articles from the Windsor "Bugle of Liberty," or "Clarion," on the necessity of suppressing the French language in Canada, and publishing articles of its own to the same purpose, it is interesting to note the action taken by several Protestant Churches in the United States in reference to the order of Commissioner Atkins, forbidding the instruction of the Indians in any language but English. The Presbyterian Synod of Indiana and other religious bodies have declared the order to be an invasion of natural rights, as well as eminently unwise. It is equivalent to the humiliating avowal that the Protestantism of the Mail and Clarion et hoc genus omne, is but the merely local thing that Lord Macaulay describes it to be, whereas they acknowledge that they can not make Protestants out of Frenchmen unless they can deprive them of their language first. Catholicity of course is a universal religion, and is suitable to every nationality and tongue; but you must denationalize a people to turn them into sound Protestants! What about the boasted missions to Quebec, then? Are they acknowledged to be dismal failures? We know that they are so, but we did not think that the Francophobes would acknowledge it so frankly. The Clarion complains that the French will not learn English. If this means that they will not learn it

perforce, as a means of driving out their own Nationality and traditions, he is right; but if he means to say that the French Canadians neglect English as a branch of study and accomplishment, he is very much mistaken. The English language and literature are much more known among French-Canadian scholars than are the language and literature of a Bossuet and a Fenelon to English scholars in Ontario. Probably the Clarion man, knowing only one language, is not aware that there exists a literature at all in any other tongue.

MR. BALFOUR AT BIRMINGHAM.

Mr. Balfour attended at Birmingham the annual meeting of the Midland Conservative Union, on Friday, the 4th inst. He was surrounded by policemen, lest any attack should be made upon him. One hundred addresses were presented to him by as many different associations throughout the country, to which he made replies, apologizing for the inefficiency of the Government's measures in Ireland. He said that certain incidents there "had caused some of their friends some misgivings, but those incidents were due, not to lack of resolution on the part of the Government, but to defects in the law, which had never contemplated the present system of organized popular rebellion."

This implies that bad and tyrannical as have been the measures of his Government, it is their intention to "not more oppressively still. Murders like those of Mitchelstown are to be repeated for no other cause than political discussion; reformers like Gallinane are to be employed to induce the people to commit crimes, so that there may be an opportunity to punish them; the suffering tenantry are to be crushed under new burdens imposed by landlords on account of their own improvements, like those of Balyke, Luggscurran and Mitchelstown, so that there may be a chance of evicting them more ruthlessly than ever, and if the Irish do not show due gratitude for being left to perish by the roadside and in the ditches, they are to be abused with all the invective of which a Balfour or a Chamberlain is capable—they are to be thrown into the felon's prison, and subjected to worse than a felon's treatment—ill death's friendly visit rescued them from the hands of their tormentors. All this and more is the redress which Mr. Balfour has to promise a nation, which, as he himself acknowledged in Parliament, needs large measures of relief.

Still Mr. Balfour does not deny, even now, that Ireland needs legislation of a character never yet accorded to her. Addressing a "large and enthusiastic audience" at night, he said "the Irish question would remain the foremost problem in the mind of everyone who took an interest in the fortunes of his country. . . . therefore Ireland would be his topic to night. The question was not whether Ireland was to be governed under her own or an English Parliament, but whether she was to be governed at all, in accordance with any of those principles which had hitherto regulated the action of every civilized state in the world."

For cool impudence this language surpasses any of the diplomatic assurances that were ever uttered by Russian Czar or Turkish Sultan. What civilized state ever governed a country as England has governed Ireland? And we need not go back to the times when penal codes were the order of the day, the darkest and most bloody codes that ever disgraced the pages of history; but the atrocities of even to day can scarcely find a parallel in the past history of poor Poland, or of the Christian provinces under Moslem rule. Mr. Balfour speaks of the principles of government recognized by civilized States. Where among civilized States will be found such atrocities as have disgraced the Government of Ireland within the last few weeks? Where, even among barbaric nations, unless perhaps in the unexplored regions of Central Africa? Yet this is the kind of rule with which Irishmen are expected to be contented, and for which they must be duly grateful to Messrs. Balfour and his associates in the Cabinet. Is it very surprising, then, that the Irish element in the United States should not be favorably predisposed towards English diplomatists: particularly diplomatists who, like Mr. Chamberlain, are in a great measure responsible for the cruelties so lately perpetrated, and which are therefore fresh in memory? Such acts must meet with stern retribution. There are ominous signs that an installment of that retribution will be meted out to Mr. Chamberlain on his arrival in America, in the almost certain event of the failure of his negotiations there; but a still more decisive retribution awaits the Salisbury-Balfour Cabinet, when the indignant voice of the three kingdoms will be heard in denunciation of them at the next elections.

The remainder of Mr. Balfour's speech was devoted to abuse of Mr. Gladstone, whom he accuses of delivering "shameful speeches, to render difficult the government of Ireland." In reality, the only shameful thing about Mr. Gladstone's truly patriotic speeches was that he denounced shameful acts. This description of the Mitchelstown occurrence is wilfully false: "If, as the Nationalists and Mr. Gladstone delight to say, the police were defeated and routed, could any one blame them if they fired?" This was too much, even for the Conservative audience he was addressing, for he was greeted with cries of "Oa! Oa!" It is well known, it being attested even by the English members of Parliament who were present, that the police were the aggressors. They attacked with batons a peaceful meeting, and after they were justly resisted, they fired wantonly on the outraged assembly. We call Mr. Balfour's representation of the case a wilful falsehood, because, according to his version, the police were wrongfully attacked in the discharge of their duty. But even if they had been wrongfully attacked, it is not justifiable to fire upon a crowd when any danger to which they might have been exposed, had passed by, as was the case at Mitchelstown. Mr. Balfour, continuing, said "he intended to stop speakers who directly advocated crime, but to tolerate those who only talked nonsense." Of what crime, then, was Lord Mayor Sullivan guilty? What crime did Sir Wilfrid Blunt advocate? Where was the crime of Mr. O'Brien, who in a case of life and death, for this was the issue, at stake if eviction had taken place, advised the tenants at Mitchelstown to retain their possession till they would, by the very fact of delay, get the benefit of a law not yet assented to, but their just title to which was already acknowledged in equity by the vote of a hostile Parliament? What was the crime of thirteen year old Maggie Lawlor, who did no more than blow a tin horn to greet Mr. Balfour's constables while they were on the road to perform his dirty work? It is for tyranny in all these cases and for the whole regime of oppression which he has established, that his name is held in execration, not only in Ireland, but throughout the civilized world.

THE SCHOOL QUESTION.

Scotland Yard cannot produce a more formidable smeller out of plots than the editor of the Mail. A few days ago he exposed no fewer than three attempts of Catholics in different parts of the United States to overthrow the Public School system. Unfortunately for his case, none of the occurrences which he made public, in a garbled form, was an attack upon the School system at all; but a matter! The Mail has undertaken to blow up the edifice of the Catholic Church in Canada, a result which even the giant who is now no more was unable to effect, but which the pigmy hopes to accomplish; so all kinds of artillery are welcome for use in his batteries, even pop-guns, whereas he can find no better. The story to which he now gives publicity is no better for his cause than the three which we already reviewed in our columns. We shall give it just as the Mail relates it:

"In Jamesburg, N. J., an attempt has been made to divide the Public School into sections, one section to be Protestant, and the other Catholic. The project has called forth a protest from the Baptist Association of New Jersey. The Association says: 'The heaven of sectarian influences in our public institutions is working silently everywhere; the attacks upon the Public School system are flagrant, and therefore we again utter our protest to the legislature of the Commonwealth, urging that the Jamesburg School be put upon the non-sectarian basis on which it was established. The desire to cause the Roman Catholics to separate themselves from the rest of the community is as strong in the United States as here; but the attempt, if it is worthy of note, is unanimously resisted by Protestants.'"

Let us assume the facts to be exactly as the Mail has stated them. That journal was caught in the act of putting a wrong construction, besides falsifying the facts regarding the three other occurrences which were related concerning the relations of Catholics to the Public schools of the United States: we need not be surprised if we find misrepresentation in the above extract also.

It is true that journal does not assert, seemingly, from himself, this time, that the Catholic action is "an attack upon the Public School system;" but this statement is quoted approvingly from the Baptist Association, and it is made the basis of editorial comment which is intended to excite the Protestant sentiment of the people of Ontario against the Catholic school system. He therefore endorses the words of the Baptist Association, and we hold him responsible for them until he repudiates them. He calls attention to the unanimity with which Protestants in the United States oppose Catholic claims, and places the position of Catholics in both countries on the same plane. Both this article in itself, and more especially, when taken in connection with the course of the Mail during the last twelve months, aims at influencing the Protestant population of this Province to join in the Mail's crusade

against Catholics in general, and against Catholic schools in particular. The Mail, therefore, evidently has the will to father the assertion of the Baptist Association that the Public Schools have been attacked, but he lacks courage to say so openly, because the fraud is too apparent to be allowed to pass without exposure.

What do the facts amount to, then, if correctly stated in the Mail? Just this, and no more: Like their fellow Catholics through both the United States and Canada, the Catholics of Jamesburg desire to have their children trained religiously. They have no wish to force their convictions on their Protestant fellow-citizens, but they do wish to have that liberty themselves which they are quite willing to accord to others. Let the Protestants teach religion or exclude it, as far as their own children are concerned, just as they please. Among them the question is debated pro and con; but the Catholics have their minds made up. Religious teaching they must have, even if an unjust law obliges them to pay double in order to obtain it. This in fact they do in all the cities and large towns in the Union. If, therefore, they can, in Jamesburg, make a friendly arrangement with their Protestant fellow-citizens by which they can secure the teaching which they must have, and at the same time remain under the operation of the Public School law, all should be rejoiced at so amicable and just a way of settling the question, without inflicting upon Catholics the injustice above indicated. But the full extent of the injustice is not seen even in the statement that Catholics are obliged to pay double for the attainment of a religious education. If they paid double, and that the amount were for the education of their own children, the injustice would not be so glaring; but when they establish parochial schools, they are in the first place taxed for the support of schools from which they derive no benefit whatever, that is to say, they are taxed for the education of other people's children, and then they tax themselves for the education of their own. Is it any wonder that they, on their part, should endeavor by all means to have this enormous grievance rectified? In Ontario the Separate School laws apply a remedy to a great extent; but even here the remedy is not complete. In the United States the evil is of such proportions that, assuming as correct the statistics given in the Mail of 3rd inst., there were last year 537,725 Catholic children taught in Catholic parochial schools, whose parents were paying the unjust double tax we have spoken of. This shows that about 2,141,000 of the population of the United States actually submit to this glaring injustice by substantial payments for the sake of religious education. It is not merely the question of doing simple justice to this population who are now unjustly dealt with, but to the entire Catholic population of the Union, and of Canada too, especially Ontario, where Catholics are in a minority. In Quebec, where Catholics form the majority, they are liberal with the Protestant minority. They willingly concede all the rights which we claim here where we are a minority. We are a minority, strong enough to be respected, but not strong enough to retain even the just rights we at present enjoy, unless outside of our own ranks there are to be found a certain number whose professions of love for "civil and religious equality" are not a mere sham. We are perfectly aware that there is a faction decidedly against us—a faction the loudest-mouthed in their professions of "civil and religious equality." Of this faction the Mail assumes a leadership. We care not whether that leadership be recognized or not. This faction we will not demean ourselves to conciliate. But there is a Protestant population who are fond of justice and fair play. To these, we feel that they can appeal with confidence that they will sustain us. Yet let us not be misunderstood. We do not appeal to them as beggars seeking for favors, but as fellow-freemen, seeking what is just, and determined to assert our rights.

We maintain that the character of the education to be given to the children is a question for the parents to decide, not for the State. It is notorious, even from the columns of the Mail, that Protestants as well as Catholics maintain this. The very debate now going on between Mr. LaSueur on the side of Agnosticism or Rationalism, and Drs. Sutherland and Laing and others on the side of Protestantism, proves this. Mr. LaSueur argues that because the religious convictions of Agnostics should not be interfered with, that religion ought not to be taught in the school at all; all even in the very mild shape of reading merely some selections from the Bible. The Protestant clergymen, on the other hand, maintain that, precisely because the Christian parent should be free to impart effectually moral and doctrinal instruction to his children, the Bible should be read and taught in all the public schools.

To give the views of these gentlemen in a short form, we may quote the Mail's summary of Dr. Sutherland's speech before the Teacher's Convention in August last: "He argued strongly for a recognition of religion as a valuable educational factor, and most people will agree with him when he says that a purely secular education supplies no adequate force for the development of moral character, and that the fundamental principles of Christian morality ought to be taught in every public school."

Thus it appears that even those whose opinion the Mail is supposed to reflect agree on the necessity of religious instruction more or less complete. We may safely say that there is a moral unanimity even among Protestants on this subject. If, then, they do not insist upon the teaching of the entire religious systems of the various denominations, it is mainly because they cannot agree among themselves as to the system which should be taught.

There is plenty of evidence that the principal Protestant bodies of the United States hold on this question similar views to those of Protestants here. Is it fair, then, or just to endeavor to prevent Catholics from giving religious education to their children? Yet this is precisely what the Baptist Association in New Jersey, and the Mail and its following in Ontario wish to do. The Mail says in the extract quoted at the beginning of this article, that the Catholic demand is "unanimously resisted by Protestants." We cannot and do not believe that Protestants generally, much less unanimously, are actuated by such a spirit of bigotry and intolerance as the Mail would have us believe; but whether or not this be the case, we inscribe on our banners the principle for which we contend: "Freedom of Education." It is difficult to believe that among those Protestants who are contending for this freedom for themselves there will be found bigots enough to succeed in depriving us of the same blessing. There are some; but we trust they are still the hopeless minority that we have in the past found them to be.

RIP VAN WINKLE ON THE LAND QUESTION.

The editor of the Free Press of this city has evidently been enjoying the sleep of Rip Van Winkle. For years he has had absolutely nothing to say on the Irish land question, which has attracted the careful consideration of all the Legislative bodies of the British Empire and the United States, and of the leaders of thought in the whole civilized world.

On awaking from his slumber, he suddenly becomes aware of the fact that there is an Irish Land Question, and that Irish tenants are objecting to be turned out wholesale from their holdings to starve; whereupon for their consolation he relates how "Mr. E. Platt opened a chemist's store on Richmond street in this city, six months ago," and failed to pay his rent, whereupon "under the auspices of Mr. V. Cronyn" all his effects have been sold at public auction, and Mr. Platt has been turned into the street." The Free Press asks why was there no adherent of Mr. Blake to denounce this outrage as Mr. Blake denounced the Irish landlords at Glen Sharrold the other day?

We have not made enquiries into the tenure under which Mr. Platt's landlord holds his property. It is presumable that his title is similar to the majority of titles in Canada, and that it is just. We can inform the Free Press, however, of the nature of the title of most of the Irish landlords, and we will give an idea of it. In the first place, the tenure by which the landlords of Ireland hold their lands is by spoilation and conquest. This evil was itself bad enough, since the despoiled consisted of the bulk of the population. But this might have been borne if legislation had been such as to afford a tolerably adequate means of support for the people. Instead of this, alien legislation, in the interests of dominant absentee landlords, by destroying Irish manufactures threw the people upon the land for support, and enabled the landlords to grind them in an excessive rent, everything that the soil was able to produce; and even if any industrious tenant improved his land, the landlord and not himself received the benefit of the improvement. The rent was raised far beyond the value of the land, and tenants unable to pay, as under such a tenure they were under most brutal conditions. The consequences of all this were evictions by many tens of thousands every year, entailing intolerable sufferings, periodical famines, and the expatriation of the people. All this has been so often proved that we need only refer Mr. Winkle to the history of the last half-century.

We say, by all means, if Mr. Platt's landlord holds his property on a tenure similar to that of the Irish landlords, more especially if Mr. Platt has equal claims with the Irish tenants to be the natural owner of the soil, the landlord, and not Mr. Platt, ought to be evicted. As Mr. Blake said of what came under his own cognizance: "The state of things is such as would call down God's curse, and ought to call down man's."

MR. CHAMBERLAIN'S MISSION.

As to the opinions entertained in the United States of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain's statesmanship, we may take the Philadelphia American as a fair sample. This journal quotes Mr. Chamberlain's words regarding the Irish in America:

"There never has been a time during the last thirty years, when the Irish in America have not been willing to use the privileges which have been conceded to them by their adopted country in order to sow dissension and promote ill feeling with Great Britain. More than once they have shown their readiness to jeopardize the best interests of their adopted country in order to avenge real or fancied injuries from their old ones, and I am not sanguine enough to anticipate that they will change their policy."

All this, the American states, "is notoriously untrue." But independently of its truth or falsehood,

"Certainly no one not devoid of diplomatic tact would have spoken as he is reported to have done, while occupying his present appointment." "Supposing this to be true, which it is not, would anything have been lost by Mr. Chamberlain's refraining from saying it? Does he suppose that he is going to get Americans to agree to anything he proposes by threatening to hold them afraid of the Irish if they refuse? By this speech Mr. Chamberlain has done so much to stir up ill feeling in America, that he is discredited entirely from representing his country in any friendly negotiation. It is the right and duty of the Canadian Government to ask his recall, in order that some person not entirely destitute of international good manners may be substituted for him."

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The hopes of Conservatives, even, are pretty low in regard to the success of Mr. Chamberlain as a diplomatic success. The Observer does not despair thereof. It can say no more. He adds, however, with an if, "we may safely leave the Irish Americans and Irish American opinion out of account," and here is where the condition comes in: "If he succeeds in perfecting an equitable adjustment." The American people are not accustomed to leave American citizens' opinion out of account, whether the Americans concerned are native born, or of Irish origin.

LORD SALISBURY himself, it is confidently asserted by the Associated Press despatches, has lost all hope of any successful issue. He is willing to console himself, in case of failure, with the reflection that Mr. Chamberlain would at all events, at some time desert the Government, so that he will return as a worn-out diplomat. He seems to not think of the possibility that the Government which sent him will also be held responsible for the blunder of entrusting an important mission to a diplomatist who begins his career by making enemies of those with whom he has to deal, or by embarrassing those who would be likely to be friendly to the object of his mission.

A LATER cable despatch states that in view of the almost certain failure indicated above, a temporary settlement has been suggested to be offered by the Commissioners, that Lord Salisbury's proposals of March last be adopted for five or ten years, without any suggestion of pecuniary indemnity. Canada is already feeling the effects of the blunder of the Government; and they may be the cause of difficulties in which the Empire will not be without scath.

MR. SPURGEON has created considerable sensation among non-conformists generally by withdrawing from the Baptist Communion, because this denomination has become so loose in the dogmatic requirements for connection with it. He considers that there are in Christianity some truths to be believed, and that their rejection should be marked with decided disapprobation. The course he has taken has called upon him the censure of the general body of non-conformists, or at least of a very large proportion of such who accuse him of saying virtually: "I do not believe as I do you must be damned." It is commonly said: "Neither Mr. Spurgeon nor any one else can arrest the movement on what he calls the downward grade. It is a movement which bases Christianity on something more vital than theological doctrines or differences." I have long been evident that the tendency of Protestantism is towards latitudinarianism, or the rejection of the primary principles of Christianity; but occasions like this make the fact more palpable still. I like the distinctive doctrines of the Christian religion are thus to be held of no account the sooner we substitute Wong Chin Foo's hesthenism or Ingersoll's "I know nothing, certain about it," the better.

THE Liberal Unionist cause is meeting with many severe blows. The partition seem to be meeting with the fate of the "teen little nigger boys" of the nursery song. Close upon the accession of Messrs. Winterbottom and Trevelyan, comes that of Mr. Buchanan. He was one of the staunchest and bitterest Unionists in the house, and was the only Unionist from Edinburgh. Having resigned his seat he will in all probability be re-elected