

Catholic Record.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JAN. 3, 1885. A LESSON OF HISTORY.

In the average Protestant intellect there is a blind and unreasoning hatred of Spain and its noble people. This hatred finds its usual expression of such a feeling, provocation and calumny. In one of the Canadian organs of the sectaries we lately read the following characteristic statement of opinion: "An American exchange says: Spain seems to be anxious to retain her glorious pre-eminence of being the most abject vassal of Rome. Like the Bourbons, its priests cling to the past, and are incapable of learning the lessons of the times. They have started a monster demonstration in every church in favor of the temporal power of the Pope. With bigoted fanaticism they are showing their dense ignorance by instigating the people to demand the re-establishment of the Inquisition. Evangelists are publicly insulted in the streets by boys of from ten to sixteen years of age shouting, 'Long live the Inquisition for the burning of all Protestants!' A preacher in the principal church of Bilbao recently said, 'Liberals do not want the Inquisition, but since there has been none in Spain, once rich, has become poor, once great, has become small. And though the black Liberals do not want the Inquisition, we must have it in order to exterminate the Protestants; and then by means of the true religion we shall bring back the splendor and greatness of the prosperous times of Philip II.' It is the boast of Rome that she does not change. Evidently some of her Spanish propagandists retain the spirit of Torquemada, and long to light the fires of the auto-da-fé."

from that period only once in two years. After it was assembled the king had no right to prorogue or dissolve it, without its own consent, and the session continued forty days. Prescott adds that not satisfied with having erected such formidable barriers against the encroachments of the royal prerogative, nor willing to commit the sole guardianship of their liberties entirely to the vigilance and authority of an assembly similar to the diets, states-general and parliaments, in which other feudal nations have placed so much confidence, the Aragonese had recourse to an institution peculiar to themselves, and elected a *justicia*, or supreme judge. This magistrate was vested with extraordinary powers. He was the supreme interpreter of the laws. Appeals lay to him from royal and local judges, and even when an appeal was made to him, he could take cognizance of the case himself, prohibiting inferior judges to proceed. It was the prerogative of the *justicia* to inspect the conduct of royalty itself. He had the right of reviewing all royal proclamations and patents, and to declare whether or not they were agreeable to law and ought to be carried into execution. He, by his sole authority, could exclude any of the king's ministers from the conduct of affairs, and call them to answer for their maladministration. He himself was accountable to the cortes only, for the manner in which he discharged the duties of his high office, and performed functions of the greatest importance that could be committed to a subject. Even in swearing allegiance to their sovereign the Aragonese devised an oath reminding him of his dependence on his subjects: "We," said the justice to the king in the name of his subjects, "we who are each of us as good, and who are altogether more powerful than you, promise obedience to your government, if you maintain our rights and liberties; but if not, not." Such were the Aragonese—such their love of liberty—such their jealous guardianship of their privileges. In Castile, according to the same writer, the executive part of the government was committed to the king, but with a prerogative extremely limited. The legislative authority resided in the cortes, composed of the nobility, the dignified ecclesiastics and the representatives of the cities. The assembly of the cortes in Castile was very ancient and seems to have been coeval with the constitution. The members of the three different orders who had a right of suffrage met in one place, and deliberated as one collective body, the decisions of which were regulated by the majority. The right of imposing taxes, of enacting laws, and of redressing grievances, belonged to this assembly; and, in order to secure the assent of the king to such statutes and regulations as were deemed salutary or beneficial to the kingdom, it was usual in the cortes to take no step towards granting money until all business relative to the public welfare was concluded. The representatives of the cities seem to have obtained a seat very early in the cortes of Castile, and soon acquired such influence and credit as were very uncommon, at a period when the splendor and pre-eminence of the nobility had eclipsed or depressed all other orders of men. The number of members from cities bore such a proportion to that of the whole cortes, as rendered them an extremely respectable body. Thus we see that the two leading kingdoms of Spain, in the days when that nation was most Catholic, dearly loved legitimate freedom and had recourse to practice the principles of constitutional government with a precision unknown for centuries after in England itself. In the latter country the sovereign, especially after the reformation, ruled the Parliament as he willed. He filled one Chamber with his creatures, and the other packed with his tools. Not satisfied with these encroachments on popular liberty he called parliament together only at his own convenience. We have before us a table of the duration of English Parliaments which clearly supports the correctness of this view. In the reign of Henry the Eighth the first parliament met January 21st, 1509, and was dissolved after one month and two days; the second had an existence of two years and one month, dying on the 4th of March, 1513. The third lived from February 3, 1514, to Dec. 22nd, 1515. The fourth perished after a precarious existence of three months and twenty-nine days. Then there came an interval of seven years without a parliament. That which met on the 3rd of November, 1520, lived because of its servility and corruption, till the 4th of April, 1528. The next died young, after a life of one month and ten days. Then came another interval without a parliament extending from July 18th, 1536, till April 28th, 1539. The parliament which met at the latter date lasted for one year, two months and twenty-six days; the next for three years, two months and thirteen days, and the last, of Henry, for one year, two months and eight days. All these parliaments were called for the mere pur-

pose of ratifying the royal will, not to initiate new legislation or to act in the slightest degree independently of the king. It is then surprising that the records of Henry's parliament are stained with usurpations, spoliation and cruelties till then unheard of! The same table shows that in the reign of Elizabeth there was no parliament from May, 1558, till January, 1562; none from January, 1567, till April, 1571; none from March, 1580, till November, 1585; none from March, 1588, till November 1592; none from April, 1593, till October, 1597; none again from February, 1598, to October, 1601. In the reign of James I., her successor, there was no parliament from February, 1611 till April, 1614, and none again from June, 1614 till January, 1620. Charles I. governed without a parliament from March, 1628 till April, 1640, while his son Charles II. kept a subservient parliament in existence for sixteen years, eight months and sixteen days. Lingard tells us that Elizabeth firmly believed and zealously upheld the principles of government established by her father: the exercise of absolute authority by the sovereign, and the duty of passive obedience in the subject. "The doctrine with which the lord-keeper Bacon opened her first parliament was indelibly inculcated by all his successors during her reign, that if the queen consulted the two houses, it was through choice, not through necessity, to the end that her laws might be more satisfactory to her people, not that they might derive any force from their assent. She possessed by her prerogative whatever was requisite for the government of the realm. She could, at her pleasure, suspend the operation of existing statutes, or issue proclamations which should have the force of law. In her opinion the chief use of parliaments was to vote money, to regulate the minutiae of trade, and to legislate for individual and local interests. To the lower house she granted, indeed, freedom of debate, but it was to be a decent freedom, the liberty of saying 'ay' or 'no'; and those that transgressed that decency were liable, as we have repeatedly seen, to feel the weight of the royal displeasure." Lingard cites the Venetian ambassador in the time of Mary as stating that "in point of fact the kings of England were become absolute lords and masters; and that, like the Grand Turk, they had established a council similar to that of the *Shah*, who preside nearly in the manner of the *Bashaws*, assembled together, constituted themselves masters not only of the people and public ministers, but also of ambassadors and princes, sent their written mandates through the hands, commanded in the most authoritative manner, and required most punctual obedience, as if their resolutions proceeded from the king himself." In 1614 the Commons protesting somewhat refractory, James I. commanded that body to proceed to the consideration of the supply, and punished their disobedience by a hasty dissolution. The next morning the most violent and refractory of the members were called before the council; they were told that, though the king had given them liberty, he had not authorized licentiousness of speech, and five of the number were committed to the Tower. Neither could they obtain their discharge before they had revealed the names of their prompters and advisers, who in their turn were called before the council and imprisoned. We need not here repeat the story of Charles I., in his unsuccessful efforts to govern without parliament, and to set at naught its resolutions. He died a sort of martyr to royal prerogative, which Charles II., and after him James II., sought to revive and re-establish. Their failure did not discourage their successors to make like attempts. George III., for instance, was by nature and instinct the most despotic sovereign of England since the Tudors. By the aid of a parliament which did not represent the people, he was enabled to secure sanction for schemes and purposes inimical to the best interests of the people and essentially subversive of their rights and privileges. Even at this very moment multitudes of Englishmen protest that they do not enjoy parliamentary government in the true sense of that term because of the existence of an hereditary chamber which steps in at most inopportune moments to reject the just demands of the people for reform. Who does not perceive that at this very moment, with all Englishmen's boasts of their freedom, an irresponsible chamber can override the decision of the people's representatives, and tell them that that which the people demand they cannot have. Is this popular government, as understood by the benighted Spaniards of old, the proud Castilians and the fearless Aragonese? Is this popular government, as understood even in Spain to-day? If any one think we overdraw the case let him hear the words of John Bright addressed to his constituents, wherein that statesman sets forth in clearest terms the extraordinary powers of the British peerage, powers incompatible

with popular freedom in the true sense of the word: "The members of the House of Peers—the 500 persons or families—are reported," he says, "to be the owners of one-fifth of the whole of the land in the United Kingdom. I do not in the least object to any man owning an estate which he has honestly come by. I would not deprive a landowner, or manufacturer, or merchant, or shopkeeper, or labourer of anything that is his; and I am not calling in question the legality of the ownership of all this land by the 500 peers, or peers' families, whose claims we are now discussing. But, besides this, I see it is reported that the 500 peers are possessors of not less—believe considerably more—than 4,000 livings of the Church of England. If this be so, then it follows that the House of Peers among them can appoint, and appoint in the main, several thousand owners of the parishes in what are to be considered the highest things. Besides this, the House of Lords, or members of that House for the most part, are lords-tenants of counties. In that office they appoint almost all the county magistrates. The county magistrates administer justice in the county, and profess to do it—and, with some exceptions, in the main, endeavour to perform their duty. Beyond this, again, the members of the House of Lords, the great landlords, exercise a very powerful control over the county representation. There are counties in which the whole representation, without fear of contest, will be found to be in the hands of two, three, or four members of the House of Lords. They have yet another peculiarity which I ought not to omit to mention, in that the great owners of land they are able to a very much lighter taxation—direct taxation—upon land than is the case with any other class of landowners in any European kingdom or in the United States of America." The right hon. gentleman then traces the disappearance of royal authority and power and asks the people if they can consent to an abuse as heinous on the part of the peers: "I shall give you what I think is an interesting fact or two with regard to this matter. Two hundred years ago—300 years ago I will go back as far as that, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth—in the reign of the Tudor monarchs the monarch was almost despotic, and could do as he liked, as Queen Elizabeth did as she liked with any bills that came up from her parliament. On one occasion, at the end of one session, having 91 bills presented to her for her acceptance, she actually and without ceremony rejected 48, or more than one-half of them. Well, we will come down through the time of the Commonwealth and the Stuarts to the reign of William III. William III. in 1693 had before him a bill called the Place Bill. The object of it was to exclude from the House of Commons all holders of offices of trust or profit under the Crown. That bill was rejected by the king. What did the House of Commons do in reply? It resolved itself into a Grand Committee, and it passed a resolution which said that the king should advise the king not to give the Royal assent to the Act which was to take effect a grievance and a scandal from the nation was an enemy to their Majesty and to the Kingdom. Now you see what the House of Commons said then to the veto of the Crown. A few years afterwards, in the year 1707, in the reign of Queen Anne, there was one unimportant bill called the Scotch Militia Bill which Queen Anne rejected, but I believe if you go down to this, a better record of 177 years, the Sovereign on the English throne has never rejected a single measure that had passed both Houses of Parliament. You will observe, then, coming down from Queen Elizabeth's time, that as freedom grew in this country, the veto declined and was finally abandoned. "The question which we have before us now is this fact, that the Lords do now what the despotic monarchs did formerly, and the question which I put to you, and from this platform to all the people of the United Kingdom is this—Shall we submit? Shall we submit, or shall we curb the nobles as our fathers curbed our kings? I may assure you that the veto of the monarch was legal in those days, and was much cherished; but it was given up and abolished. Yet the throne was not overturned. The throne remained, and it remained with an undiminished dignity, and from that time to this it has been held in great and just reverence by the great bulk of the people of this country. How, then, should we curb the House of Lords? At present, you know that when within their own walls they are, in a sense, omnipotent. They can, if they like, I believe, turn out any one of their own members, in the same way that the House of Commons has turned out one of its members."

Wealthy Irishmen.

The idea that Irishmen, and especially Irish Catholics, have no standing in the commercial world is a common but erroneous one. The fact is that on the Pacific slope there are ten Irishmen who own between them \$418,000,000. Their names are as follows:— J. W. Mackey ..... \$150,000,000 Jas. C. Flood ..... 68,000,000 J. C. Fair ..... 50,000,000 L. Coleman, and O'Brien ..... 50,000,000 Peter Donohue ..... 25,000,000 Hugh McGuire ..... 20,000,000 C. B. Crocker ..... 20,000,000 Luke Cavanaugh ..... 15,000,000 Gerald Malone ..... 12,000,000 W. J. O'Reilly ..... 8,000,000 \$418,000,000 All those men with the single exception of C. E. Crocker, are Roman Catholics, and there are no ten men of any nationality who can show such an amount of wealth as these ten Irishmen.—San Francisco News Letter.

with popular freedom in the true sense of the word: "The members of the House of Peers—the 500 persons or families—are reported," he says, "to be the owners of one-fifth of the whole of the land in the United Kingdom. I do not in the least object to any man owning an estate which he has honestly come by. I would not deprive a landowner, or manufacturer, or merchant, or shopkeeper, or labourer of anything that is his; and I am not calling in question the legality of the ownership of all this land by the 500 peers, or peers' families, whose claims we are now discussing. But, besides this, I see it is reported that the 500 peers are possessors of not less—believe considerably more—than 4,000 livings of the Church of England. If this be so, then it follows that the House of Peers among them can appoint, and appoint in the main, several thousand owners of the parishes in what are to be considered the highest things. Besides this, the House of Lords, or members of that House for the most part, are lords-tenants of counties. In that office they appoint almost all the county magistrates. The county magistrates administer justice in the county, and profess to do it—and, with some exceptions, in the main, endeavour to perform their duty. Beyond this, again, the members of the House of Lords, the great landlords, exercise a very powerful control over the county representation. There are counties in which the whole representation, without fear of contest, will be found to be in the hands of two, three, or four members of the House of Lords. They have yet another peculiarity which I ought not to omit to mention, in that the great owners of land they are able to a very much lighter taxation—direct taxation—upon land than is the case with any other class of landowners in any European kingdom or in the United States of America." The right hon. gentleman then traces the disappearance of royal authority and power and asks the people if they can consent to an abuse as heinous on the part of the peers: "I shall give you what I think is an interesting fact or two with regard to this matter. Two hundred years ago—300 years ago I will go back as far as that, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth—in the reign of the Tudor monarchs the monarch was almost despotic, and could do as he liked, as Queen Elizabeth did as she liked with any bills that came up from her parliament. On one occasion, at the end of one session, having 91 bills presented to her for her acceptance, she actually and without ceremony rejected 48, or more than one-half of them. Well, we will come down through the time of the Commonwealth and the Stuarts to the reign of William III. William III. in 1693 had before him a bill called the Place Bill. The object of it was to exclude from the House of Commons all holders of offices of trust or profit under the Crown. That bill was rejected by the king. What did the House of Commons do in reply? It resolved itself into a Grand Committee, and it passed a resolution which said that the king should advise the king not to give the Royal assent to the Act which was to take effect a grievance and a scandal from the nation was an enemy to their Majesty and to the Kingdom. Now you see what the House of Commons said then to the veto of the Crown. A few years afterwards, in the year 1707, in the reign of Queen Anne, there was one unimportant bill called the Scotch Militia Bill which Queen Anne rejected, but I believe if you go down to this, a better record of 177 years, the Sovereign on the English throne has never rejected a single measure that had passed both Houses of Parliament. You will observe, then, coming down from Queen Elizabeth's time, that as freedom grew in this country, the veto declined and was finally abandoned. "The question which we have before us now is this fact, that the Lords do now what the despotic monarchs did formerly, and the question which I put to you, and from this platform to all the people of the United Kingdom is this—Shall we submit? Shall we submit, or shall we curb the nobles as our fathers curbed our kings? I may assure you that the veto of the monarch was legal in those days, and was much cherished; but it was given up and abolished. Yet the throne was not overturned. The throne remained, and it remained with an undiminished dignity, and from that time to this it has been held in great and just reverence by the great bulk of the people of this country. How, then, should we curb the House of Lords? At present, you know that when within their own walls they are, in a sense, omnipotent. They can, if they like, I believe, turn out any one of their own members, in the same way that the House of Commons has turned out one of its members."

THE STATE OF RUSSIA.

The condition of Russia, social, political and religious, is now engaging wide-spread attention. The abolition of serfdom wrought a marvellous change in the social condition of Russia, the real effects of which are now beginning to be felt. The peasantry is, in the Russian empire, felt to be a great power, whose influence must, before long, extend to every department of the administration. The Russian mind has, in fact, of late been set thinking. And once a whole people are seized with a thinking spell, it is difficult to forecast the future. The Nihilist movement has not, it is true, as far as the organization itself is concerned, extended to any appreciable degree, to the masses of the people outside the cities. But it has had an influence on the peasants, which, if administrative and governmental reforms be long delayed, must end in grave civil commotions. The Church in Russia has no influence whatever on the people. But lately we were assured that a religious revolution was threatened in the country. The Czar, as is well known, for many generations been recognized as the religious as well as the political head of the state. In the Russian system he is Pope as well as King. No bishop or metropolitan can hold office without the seal of the Czar, not in his capacity as emperor, but as the viceregent of God. Lately, however, we were told that a set of dissenters had arisen which threatens the overthrow of this belief in divine election. These dissenters have their headquarters in Moscow, and have thousands of adherents throughout the empire. They are not Nihilists, and do not seek to subvert the existing Government, but simply discard the religious ritual used by the loyalists, and deny the religious supremacy of the Czar. It is stated, however, that they are committing acts of fanaticism which will make them subject to the severe penal laws of Russia, and that they will be thus crushed out of existence as other religious rebels have been. If they are crushed out of existence it will be solely through the intervention of the civil power, the Church being, as we have said, powerless for good or evil. We were lately very forcibly struck by the views of the American on the sad condition of religion in the Russian: "In Russia the Church," says that journal, "is torpid, if not moribund, as an intellectual influence. It has lost all hold on educated public opinion. It celebrates rites, builds churches, and goes through all the forms of Church life. But it does nothing to meet the yearnings of the nineteenth century. As a consequence nothing but repression is used to meet the negative tendencies dominant among the educated Russians. Count Tolstoy, the brilliant but unpractical minister of education, looks indeed to the influence of the sound classical training as likely to counteract the shallow tendencies of the materialistic and atheistic movement. To effect this he has imposed on the intermediate schools a standard of classic teaching so high as to compel many of the pupils to cease their work. Even Count Pobedonosev, and his colleague Professor Pobedonosev, seem to place no reliance on the church. Their other weapon is repression of any literature they think dangerous in tendency. The Moscow Annals, which held a place only to be compared with the *Revue des Deux Mondes* in France, has been compelled to cease publication by the severity of the new censorship. A list of books, some of them of altogether innocent tendency, such as Adam Smith's 'Wealth of Nations,' has been placed on the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* from the government. As the effect will be to secure every such book an extensive circulation in secret, it is to be regretted that the majority of these books are not as wholesome reading as that we have named." The Church, therefore, hopes, through the repressive measures adopted by the government, to maintain its ill-gotten and ill-deserved supremacy. The present political relations of Russia are not quite satisfactory. True, there is at present a feeling, if not of friendliness, one of easy indifference, to Germany. Not so, however, in the case of Austria. Towards that power there is entertained a feeling of deepest hostility, traceable to the war of 1876. Austria secured, by the treaty of Berlin, much of the predominance in South-Eastern Europe for which Russia fought with Turkey. And, as another war might prove too expensive, Austria is likely, for some time, to retain that predominance. Hence the ill-feeling. In material progress Russia is making rapid advancement. The balance of trade is now in favor of the empire, and the home market is held by the home manufacturers. The building of the great railway southward through Persia must have the effect of rendering that great country commercially subject to Russia. What Russia imperatively requires is good honest government. Till the present despotic system be effaced there can be no just hope of continued tranquility or well-founded prosperity. With free institutions Catholicity would, in Russia, whose people are of a religious turn in the best sense of the term, make great and rapid progress. Health is impossible when the blood is impure, thick, and sluggish, or when it is thin and impoverished. Under such conditions, boils, pimples, headaches, neuralgia, rheumatism, and one disease after another is developed. Take Ayer's Sarsaparilla, and it will make the blood pure, rich, warm, and vitalizing.

JAPAN AND THE JAPANESE.

Anything concerning Japan will be read with interest by Catholics. That great country was at a comparatively early date evangelized by Catholic missionaries. It has had its apostles and its martyrs. For nearly two hundred years, however, its gates were closed to Christian missionaries and the profession of Christianity made a crime. Now, however, a brighter era seems to dawn for that great country. Its political condition has of late undergone changes of a radical character, but before referring to these changes, let us say a word or two concerning its physical features, political condition, its fiscal and commercial status. Japan, in these regards, is thus described: "An ancient and extensive Empire, consisting of several large and many small islands, said to comprise in all above 3,800, the principal of which are Nippon, or Nihon (which in Japan gives name to the whole empire), Shikoku, Kiushiu, and Yezo, the latter being a colonial dependency, situate to the north of the main island, Nippon, from which it is separated by the Tsugaru Straits. The Kurili Islands belong to Japan, and she has recently incorporated Loochoo under the name of 'Prefecture of Okinawa.' The empire comprises an area estimated at 147,629 square miles, with a population of 35,925,313. Japan is said to possess a written history extending over 2,600 years, and its sovereigns to have formed an unbroken dynasty since 660 A.C., the present Emperor being the 123rd of his race, but the actual history begins about 400 A.D. Within the last few years Japan has made unparalleled progress in civilization and the adoption of Western manners and customs. The feudal system, under which the country was governed by numerous lords, has been abolished, and the Mikado is now absolutely the Sovereign of the State. The islands are eminently volcanic, and several of the summits are still eruptive; the chief of these, Fuji-san, or Fuji yama, one of the most sacred mountains of Japan, about sixty miles from Tokio, is 12,385 feet high. The country is very mountainous, and not more than one-third of its area is available for cultivation. It possesses two or three large harbours. The soil is productive, teeming with every variety of agricultural produce. Copper, iron, and sulphur abound; agate, corallian, and rock crystal are also found. Gold and silver mining is prosecuted on a substantial scale, and a fair supply of minding coal may be noted. The camphor tree, paper mulberry, vegetable wax-tree, which also furnishes the celebrated 'laquer' of Japan. The principal timber trees are the Cryptomeria Japonica, Pinus Massalottii, and Zelkova Keaki; the maple is merely ornamental. Chestnut, oak, beech, and elm are comparatively rare and little used. The tobacco-plant, tea-shrub, potato, rice, wheat, and other cereals, are all cultivated; agriculture, upon which the Japanese bestow great care, being their chief occupation. The chief products are, in the main, rice, silk, cotton, yam, shirting, muscadine, velvet, cloths, and other piece-goods; metals, drugs, and medicines are also among the imports. Sugar is largely imported from China. The chief exports are tea, silk, silkworms, eggs, cottons, lacquer-wares, copper, camphor, and dried fish. The internal trade of Japan is very extensive, and consists of 31,440 men on a peace footing, and is increased to 46,050 in time of war; the navy of 12 vessels, of which five are iron-plated. Under treaties with the United States and several European powers, the ports of Kanagawa, Hiogo, Nagasaki, Hakodate, and Niigata are open to trade, as also is the city of Tokio and Osaka. Estimated public revenue, 1881-82: \$10,000,000. Public expenditure, 1881-82: \$14,000,000. Total debt 30th June, 1881: \$1,300,000. Public debt (in specie debt) 1881: \$1,242,074. Public National Debt, 1881: \$1,000,000. Imports from United Kingdom, 1880: \$5,300,000. Exports to United Kingdom, 1880: \$5,300,000. Capital.—Tokio, formerly called Edo, the residence of the Mikado; population, 800,000. Other cities are Magoya, 125,000, and Kioto, the ancient capital, 225,000. In an American contemporary we recently read that a remarkable movement is on foot in Japan looking to the adoption of the Christian religion as the religion of the state. The recent larger intercourse into which the Japanese have been brought with Europe and America has led them into serious considerations on the all-important matter of religion. They noticed, it is unfortunately true, that many people in Europe and America live even below the standard of Buddhist morality, but did not fail to perceive that while in Japan no one is at liberty to depart from the moral standard of Buddha and Confucius, the obedience the Christian religion demands is free, voluntary, and instructive. Neither have they failed to observe that the lives led by Christian missionaries and by consistent members of Christian churches are something higher and better than the life prescribed to the priests of Shintoism or Buddhism. They quite understand that while Christianity cannot compel men to live soberly, righteously and godly, it enables those who wish to do so as does no other form of faith. "The growing influence in favor of Christianity," says the same journal, "seen in public affairs. By an imperial decree the official Shinto and Buddhist priesthood has been disestablished, and all religions thus reduced to the same footing. Some of the local governments have taken steps to suppress the public brothel, whose sanction by the government has been a moral disgrace to the country. They will not expel the women now occupying those licensed haunts of vice, but they will allow of no fresh accessions to their

number. This is which Japanese opted for above its pride of modesty and the force which binds are as yet hardly dition influence is to Our American welcoming the gro Christianity seems constrained, we the great that the Japan simulating its pov that of the western good and bad med like judicious dis instances, after the States, reduced all level of equal liberta tion, without recog the state. But it established a peerag where the latter cou its lords. Besides, tive law after the Germany. Every y piro, on reaching a pass three entire y military service poss four years more in It is at this distan see what are the reasons Mikado's government a policy. Japan's hand is China, but would enable Japan offensive war on Chi tainly required to herself from China strength of China lies and she has not the army over the sea. is anxious to form a herself from Europe which she has in the little, but if this w would be more usefu an army. It may American contemporar "The new policy h France with a view against China in the already to be a kin between these two There have been J Japan's part to fur with coal and other for French support of Loo Choo islands, sign and conquest F for herself in the C must involve more the Pekin Government course, France is muc for China. But she l coolly to maintain such a distance and surroundings. By a and defensive with J port her fleet by an in quality as that of there may be bene Loo Choo Islands, Japanese superiority perhaps the annexa of them objects of wa If Japan has real French guidance, at peace with China, ment has, no doubt, signs in respect of Ch of a great Franco-G one of the possible re conflict. To bring abo to French national laudable from many assistance and co-oper France may not only necessary. THE ARCHBISHOP THE TEMPERANCE A very interesting in Thuries on Sunday the temperance mov and indefatigable a town, Father James close on 300 adults, Grace the Most Rev Archbishop of Austral three o'clock, to cre teetotal pledge mea him some words of advice. There are no abstainers in Thuries, women, the Juvenile established in Thurie ago, forming an int 300 strong, Prayers b spiritual director, The archbishop blea dly invited each of them. Then, standi he said: "My dear fr you and myself as every touching and every right to be gra as it does in my own it is true and incoo parishes of the dioces tain sense, in so far supreme pastoral ju and an responsible well-being before m fact that this paria a special manner, and it therefore is. Speaking generally, what is called the become thereby roughly be divid First, there are the pledge is absolutely come those for wh And this latter divi division into the lar and families, who habitually, drink a never, perhaps, or drink to absolute ex denominated drink larger body of indiv to excess, and who placed teetotallers, notion of God's cre others, and their virtue. Now I say right and proper fo