

Sir Adam George Archibald, who passed away at his home in Truro, N. S., on the 14th inst., at the ripe age of seventy-nine years, was one of the rapidly diminishing number of the fathers of the Canadian Confederation. Prior to that consummation he had been a Liberal in Nova Scotia politics and a friend and supporter of the Hon. Joseph Howe, under whom he twice held office in his native Province, first as Solicitor-General and afterwards as Attorney General. So early as 1857 he was a delegate to England, in company with the late Judge Johnson, then Attorney General and leader of the Conservative Government of Nova Scotia, charged, amongst other business, with feeling the pulse of the British Government on the question of union of the Provinces. He was one of the delegates at the Conference which met at Charlottetown, in 1864, to consider the question of a union of the Maritime Provinces. When that was merged in the larger Quebec Conference he was one of the Nova Scotia representatives in that body, and he also was a member of the conference in England by which the structure was finally completed. At the proclamation of the Union, in 1867, Mr. Archibald was sworn in as Secretary of State for the Provinces, but in consequence of the wave of hostility to the Confederation which swept over Nova Scotia, he failed of re-election. Two years later he was elected to the Commons, where he retained his seat until 1870, when he was appointed Lieut.-Governor of Manitoba. After his resignation of that position, in 1873, he was appointed Judge in Equity for his native province, and, a few months later, on the death of the Hon. Joseph Howe, he became its Lieut.-Governor. In 1888 he again entered the House of Commons, as member for Colchester. For the past year or two he has been living in retirement. He was appointed C.M.G. in 1873 and K.C.M.G. in 1885. He was a man of ability and integrity, and highly respected by all who knew him.

Much interest attaches to the utterances of the Papal delegate, Mgr. Satolli, now in the United States, in regard to the school question. It is possible that too much importance is being attributed to what may prove after all to be but the expression of the opinions of an individual or of a party, but there seems good reason to believe that his presence and pronouncements mark the taking of a new attitude by the authorities of the Vatican towards the public school system. If such prove to be the case, the fact will afford another evidence of the wisdom of the Holy See in adapting itself to the inevitable, and making the best of a system it may not approve but cannot control. It is true that Mgr. Satolli's expressions are carefully chosen and modified, yet they can scarcely admit of any other meaning than that the Church of Rome is prepared to accept and use the public schools in all cases in which it is impracticable to establish and maintain efficient parochial schools. He declares that "there is no repugnance" to schools by means of which "citizens are formed to moral goodness while they live peaceably together," that "the Catholic Church in general, and especially the Holy See," while shrinking from the absence of religious instruction, is "far from condemning or treating with indifference the public schools." He goes further and says unambiguously: "If Catholic parents make sufficient provision for

the religious training of their children, let them be free to secure in other ways that education which the position of their family requires."

This is as it should be. If Mgr. Satolli goes on to lay down strict conditions and injunctions touching the religious training which he deems needful to the fulfilment of the Church's duty to her children, no one will find fault with that. No State in which the principles of religious freedom are understood will interpose any unnecessary obstacle. Rather will all proper facilities be afforded. Sectarian religious instruction during school hours is, of course, out of the question. It is perhaps doubtful whether it would be wise to make provision for it in the school-room at other hours. But to the proposal to give it in some other, perhaps adjoining building, immediately before or after school hours, for all who choose to receive it, there can be no possible objection. In fact that is a proposal with which the State authorities have really nothing to do. But the probabilities are that the Catholics will find it necessary to rely largely, as do the Protestants, upon the Sunday School, for formal religious teaching. This whole agitation and movement in the United States has a special interest for us in Canada, at the present moment. It is evident that there are many among the more intelligent and progressive Catholics on that side of the line who are loyal supporters and advocates of the public school, realizing that in it alone can they secure thorough work according to the most approved methods, and thus save their children from being placed at a disadvantage in the struggle for existence in all their after lives. Doubtless there are many in Ontario who take the same enlightened view of the subject. If only some beneficent influence would lead our French Catholic fellow-citizens to do the same, one of the most serious problems which now perplexes us would be happily solved.

Every one who believes in hearing both sides of a question must have been glad of the opportunity given to the people of Toronto and vicinity, the other evening, to listen to the eloquent presentment by Mr. T. W. Russell, M. P., of the case against Irish Home Rule, from the point of view of a British Liberal Unionist. It has been stated that Mr. Russell came to Canada mainly with a view to studying for himself our system of home rule, in order that he might be the better able to judge of the feasibility of such a system for Ireland. A cynic, after hearing his impassioned speech in the Adelaide Street rink, might insinuate a doubt as to the judicial quality of the temper in which the eloquent orator is likely to approach such an investigation. Without attempting a review of that speech in detail, we may mention two things which struck us particularly in regard to it. The first was that to plead repeated acts of simple justice wrought by the British Parliament for Ireland as so many reasons for withholding from her other privileges which she claims also in the name of justice, is not the most convincing kind of argument. "What," Mr. Russell asked, "had the Imperial Parliament done for Ireland? It had emancipated the Roman Catholics, disestablished the Church of the minority, established national education and brought it to the door of every peasant in the

land, etc." So far good. But how did it happen, one might query, that Catholics needed emancipation, that there was a Church of the minority to disestablish, and so forth? Should one restore to a dependent a sheep which his father had taken away by violence, it would be a little unreasonable to accuse the recipient of ingratitude if he should also demand the restoration of the cow which had been taken at the same time.

The other remarkable point, as it seemed to us, in Mr. Russell's address was his contention that, notwithstanding the loss of so many of her people, Ireland has still as many as she can support. That some portions of the island are overcrowded we all know. But are there no other fertile portions which are far from having their fair share of inhabitants? Are there no great estates largely unoccupied, no vast game preserves in the hands of absentee landlords, no undeveloped manufacturing and trading possibilities?

That the agitation for protection in Great Britain is gaining considerable strength among the agricultural population is not at all wonderful. The succession of poor crops, combined with the almost unprecedentedly low prices of most kinds of farm produce, has caused a great straitness and depression among those who live by the cultivation of the soil. Naturally discontent and unrest follow, and those who suffer begin to cast about for some means of relief. It is not unlikely that, if a return to a broad tax were possible, the farmers' condition might be improved, just as the condition of some manufacturers in Canada has been improved by the N.P., though no doubt the capitalist landlords there would reap the lion's share of the gain, just as the capitalist manufacturers have done in Canada and the United States. There would be this difference, however, that while the Canadian system of protection enriches the few manufacturers at the expense of the many farmers, the protection desired by the British landlords would help the few landlords at the expense of the many artisans. It is the misfortune of the British agriculturists that the low prices of food products which impoverishes them is the greatest boon to a large majority of their fellow-countrymen. This renders the agitation for protection hopeless. But it is almost inevitable that the depression may compel somewhat radical changes of another kind in England. It is evident that the land is no longer able to support all who have hitherto relied on it for a living. The Kentish farmer may have to take hold of the plough stilt with his own hands, and the landlord will have to become a producer of some kind, and no longer a mere consumer of the fruits of others' toil.

#### AN INDEPENDENT CANADA.

Those who are studying the currents of public opinion in Canada at the present time can scarcely fail to have observed, notwithstanding their sluggish flow and somewhat bewildering eddies, that during the last few months some of them have been setting very perceptibly in the direction of national independence as the ultimate solution of the Canadian question. Having long been of opinion that an independent Canada was at