

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT 600 RICHMOND ST. LONDON, ONTARIO.

REV. JOHN F. COFFEY, M. A., L. D., EDITOR THEO. COFFEY, F. B. AND PROP.

GENERAL AGENTS: Messrs. Donat Crowe and Luke King. OTTAWA AGENCY: F. J. Coffey, General Agent, 74 George St.

Subscription rates: One copy, 50c; Six copies, \$2.50; Twelve copies, \$4.50. Payment in advance.

Approved by the Bishop of London, and the Archbishop of Toronto, the Bishops of Ottawa, Hamilton, Kingston, and Peterboro, and leading Catholic Clergymen throughout the Dominion.

Catholic Record.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JAN. 15, 1887. FREEMASONRY A GREAT EVIL.

The Masonic body, especially in the English-speaking countries, was deeply distressed when Pope Leo XIII, in his admirable Encyclical Humanum Genus, struck it with a renewed and emphasized condemnation.

Why should Freemasonry be placed outside the pale of Catholicity, seeing that they are nothing but a harmless friendly society of benevolents, with no other object but that of driving dull care away by means of a set of mysteries which every one knows to be meant for naught but mystification?

Thus reasoned a good many people at the time when the late Pope Pius IX pronounced condemnation of that institution and its votaries.

Let us consult a little book recently published at Leipzig under the title "The Papal Church and the Free Masons" (Die Papstkirche und die Freimaurer) to see what the real aims of "the Craft" are.

1st.—The breaking up of every ecclesiastical authority.

2nd.—The complete separation of Church and State.

3rd.—The abolition of all religious instruction.

4th.—The humanization of family life, i. e., doing away with religious marriages, baptisms, church worship, etc.

5th.—Winning over the women by the suppression of all convents and conventual establishments.

This is the programme of Freemasonry in Germany, which does not go anything like so far as the French and Belgian programmes, for both in France and Belgium the very belief in the existence of the Deity is now looked upon as rank treason to the masonic craft, so much so that in the decrees of the French "Grand Orient" the words, "To the glory of the Great Architect of the Universe," which were compulsory but twenty-five years ago, have disappeared.

Let there be no mistake; both Pius VII and Pius IX. knew what they were about when they condemned Freemasonry. [See XIII. also.]

The Universe here very clearly reproduces the Masonic platform. Take France, take Italy or Spain, and are not the aims above given very steadily, persistently and defiantly pursued by Masons and their sympathizers? Are not all the leading anti-clericalists Masons? Do they not carry their elections through the machinery of the loafs? Do they not draw their financial aid from the powerful and controlling Jewish element in the organization? Is not the press of continental Europe literally owned or notoriously subsidized by Jewish masonic money? Yet there are Catholics gullible enough—the word is none too strong—there are, we say, Catholics gullible enough to believe Masonic declarations of benevolence, fraternity and the like, and some, too, wicked enough to enter the portals of that anti-Christian body.

We argue not for the destruction of the Masonic organization by force, but we do think that there is a pressing and imperative duty resting upon all Catholics to combat this great evil by every legitimate and peaceful means in their power.

At this very moment the Holy Father is a real, not nominal, prisoner in the Vatican. The head of the Church is as much constrained by persecution, as much bereft of liberty, as were any of his venerable predecessors in Imperial Rome. He dare not leave the Vatican to appear in public in his own Eternal City. His life, as it is, is not at any time worth a week's lease, with the bitter enemies that surround him, some of whom openly threaten to destroy the Vatican with dynamite.

TO MUCH OF ONE THING.

It is not often that we can agree with the Ottawa Citizen, but its views on the Howland re-election episode in Toronto are so sound and incontrovertible that we cannot but favor our readers with their perusal.

The speeches delivered by Mr. Howland and his supporters in Toronto when the result of the Mayoralty contest became known were of an extraordinary character.

The name of the Almighty was frequently introduced by the re-elected Mayor, and other speakers made frequent mention of the holy name. The enthusiasm was so great at one stage of the publications that an enthusiast led off by singing "Praise God from Whom all blessings flow," by the grand old doxology being joined in by the thousands of citizens assembled to rejoice over Mr. Howland's victory.

It may be that Toronto up to Mr. Howland's election as Mayor was the vilest city on the continent—a city reeking with all manner of corruption and every description of vice, and that Mr. Howland was destined to prove a moral Hercules whose mission was to clean out that Augean stable; but outsiders will be of the opinion that the Howland business is being over-done, and that after all the "Queen City" was not so surprisingly wicked as he and his supporters and some of the newspapers would make out. He is a first class man in many respects, no doubt; but the contention that his re-election was an absolute necessity in the interests of law, order and morality is a fiction on the city's good name and upon the many good men who have filled the position of Chief Magistrate in the past.

If large majorities were an indication of unquestionable excellence, then Mr. Howland is the most excellent person Ontario has yet produced. In the contest of Monday, January 3rd, he polled a total of 9,220 against 6,943 cast for Mr. David Blain. In the contest for 1896 he obtained over Mr. A. E. Manning, a very worthy man, a majority of 1,718—till then something unheard of in municipal elections.

Majorities are not, however, a safe criterion to guide judgments as to the merits or demerits of a public man. Some of the wickedest, most unprincipled, unprincipled and villainous, and at times, too, some of the stupidest of our politicians have obtained elections by very large majorities, while men good and true either suffered ignominious defeat or barely secured by narrow votes the place they or their friends coveted for them. Mr. Howland is overdoing things in Toronto. It is too late in the day now to govern any city on this continent on the blue laws which obtained a century ago in Connecticut and Massachusetts. We know that system of government has led with our neighbors, Toronto will get over—at least we hope so—this temporary aberration and seek by solid means to become a lastingly moral and religious city. These means are within its reach and it should take advantage of them. While dealing with the subject of "Too much of one thing," we may be permitted to state that the Citizen is itself a gross sinner in respect of the sickening "No Popery" cry that the Mail has shrieked to the disgust of all honest men. The Citizen, during the election campaign, claimed that the insults heaped upon the Catholics by the Mail were simply the views of the Mail and of nobody else. Whereupon the Ottawa Free Press of the 5th asked:

If this is so, whose view does the Citizen represent when in to-day's issue it heaps an infamous insult upon an Archbishop of the Roman Catholic Church in Ontario, who is respected alike by Roman Catholics and Protestants, and also insults a Conservative who dared to rise superior to party. What does the Citizen mean when it speaks this morning about

"The Lynch Kid Lewis Protestant combination against Backsville?" This insulting accusation of names is by the Ottawa Citizen, not the Toronto Mail, and why the names of Archbishop Lynch, Louis Riel and Alderman elect Lewis should be strung together by the

Citizen in this manner unless to insult the first and last named, cannot be explained? The Toronto Mail has never descended to a course lower than this. We know that the Citizen is at heart as thoroughly anti-Catholic as the Mail. It lacks the courage and the brilliancy, but is animated with all the bitterness of the latter. Let it take up the No Popery cry and an indignant country will bury it in oblivion.

THE BRITISH ARISTOCRACY.

The English aristocracy has of late obtained very unenviable celebrity. In fact, its very name now excites a veritable moral stench that the Christian world refuses to endure. Nothing can better serve to bring the hereditary legislative chamber, the laws of primogeniture, and the rest of the feudal injustices and anomalies into contempt, than the ill conduct of the nobility in social life. There is not one moral law for the people and another for the aristocracy. A writer in the Montreal Herald, of Dec. 23rd, contributes a letter on which we shall attempt to make no comment. Its opening paragraphs speak volumes in themselves.

His letter is dated London, Dec. 8th, and he begins by saying: "The latter half of last month—November—will be memorable in the annals of Great Britain, owing to the causa celeberrima which have come before them, the high position of the parties impugned, and the record which they present of heartlessness, cupidity, brutishness, infidelity, libertinism and immorality. Perhaps in no other country in the world, at the present day, and in a Christian land, are so many and so grossly tainted the air and offended all the decent proprieties of life have been exposed to the pure light of day as those which have disgraced the upper tennor in aristocratic circles in the Kingdom of England during the expiring days of November."

He then proceeds to enumerate for the information and thoughtful perusal of the readers of our Montreal contemporary four cases, three in the Divorce and one in the Divisional Court. The enumeration is a painful one. We abbreviate it for obvious reasons.

Miss Lina Mary Scott, eldest daughter of the late Sir Charles Scott, and Arthur Schright, son of Sir John Schright, for a nullity of her marriage with him, on the ground that it had been forced upon her by fear, terror and fraud, and that she did not thoroughly understand the nature of the ceremony of marriage before a registrar.

Sir Henry Costa Lee Edwards asks to be divorced from his wife, Agnes Martha Clarke, on the ground of marital infidelity.

Mr. Charles Warren Adams institutes proceedings for libel against his father-in-law, Lord Coleridge, Lord Chief Justice of England, and his son, the Hon. Bernard Coleridge, M. P., and places his damages at £20,000.

Lady Colin Campbell applies for a dissolution of her marriage with her husband, Lord Colin Campbell, fifth son of the Duke of Argyll and brother of the Marquis of Lorne, on account of his criminal conduct; and as a counter case Lord Colin Campbell pleads to be divorced from his wife because of her alleged general misconduct.

The enumeration of criminality is a very painful recitation on the evils attendant upon hereditary wealth and title. How true it appears from these and other scandals that have of late shocked the civilized world that idleness is the mother of vice. The nobility of England know nothing of the arduous struggle for life in which all not born rich are of a necessity engaged. They are in too many cases bred in idleness and at an early age form habits of refined viciousness which yield heavy crops of crime and degradation. Here in America we have an aristocracy of intellect and of merit whose very existence depends upon its personal regard for the moral law—an aristocracy to which none in Europe can compare. Here in this free land, we speak both of Canada and the United States, every man is a lord. He is a sovereign citizen upon whose will depends the making and the unmaking of laws, of magistrates, of legislators and administrators. There is here no inherited title and little of inherited wealth. Monopoly has indeed shown its hand and made its cruel power felt even in America, but with a free ballot-box no one need fear that America's freedom will be crushed even by gigantic monopolies. Their existence will tend to make the people more vigilant and more active. There is an unfortunate tendency on this side of the Atlantic, too prevalent among our republican neighbors, but as yet barely observable in Canada, to worship foreign titles and a distant aristocracy. The Baltimore Catholic Mirror of Dec. 11th, felt constrained to rebuke, in terms sharp and severe, this painful tendency. The Mirror wrote:

"Giddy American girls who dearly love a lord, and are willing to marry any sort of thing so it has a title, should take warning by the recent developments of the divorce courts."

"Miss Anna Reid, of Union, N. Y., a beautiful and accomplished young lady, married Sir Arthur Percy Fitzgerald Aylmer, baronet, in 1854. He has the blood of blue blood, an old estate, and \$70,000 a year. According to the testimony, Sir Arthur, two days after the wedding, attempted to strangle and smother his wife, and later beat her with his walking stick and fist."

"Miss Beesie Curtis, a New York girl recently got a divorce from her husband, a French marquis, and, despite the warning, the younger sister has just married a French aristocrat. What sort of people these foreign aristocrats are has been shown in the Colin Campbell case, the details of which have been sickening American newspaper readers for the past two weeks."

We hope that neither in Canada nor in the United States will ever be established any institution akin to the feudal aristocracy of Britain. The feudal system had its merits and served in its own good time a noble purpose, but usefulness hath long since parted with the system and it now stands an attenuated tottering remnant of absent vitality and almost forgotten greatness. The future of Canada and of the United States depends on their fidelity to democratic institutions. "All men equal in the eye of the law" should be the guiding principle of Canadian political life. Upon our fidelity to that principle, upon our strict adherence to its teachings rests our security, our peace and our prosperity.

A CHAMPION OF CATHOLIC EDUCATION.

In the days when toilers in the good cause were few, when fighters in the arduous battle for educational right could be counted on the finger ends of one hand, then appeared one man who never tired of work or of battle, one man whose heart was so much in his work, and enlisted so fully on his side of the battle, that he never suffered discouragement or temporary disaster to rob him of hope. This one man, a natural leader of men, is the Right Rev. Bernard J. McQuaid, first Bishop of Rochester. Catholic America owes him more than its gratitude can ever repay. The cause that he more than forty years ago espoused, the cause to which he has devoted the best years of his life and the rarest talents of a gifted mind, is not now the unpopular, the reputedly impracticable cause it was away back in the days of Know Nothingism. It has of late years gained much favor amongst the American people, thanks to him and those like him, blessed with minds of broad and clever grasp—men courageous, outspoken, fearless, dreading neither the sneer of the internal foe nor the fierce onslaught of the avowed enemy. The services of Bishop McQuaid to the cause of Catholic education and to true American freedom are too precious to be ever covered with oblivion's dark pall. Patriotism, honor, gratitude all forbid.

The Boston Pilot, the pioneer Catholic journal of the United States, lately gave utterance to American national sentiment in respect of Bishop McQuaid's life-long advocacy of the cause of the little ones of Christ's fold.

"Now," said our Boston contemporary, "that Catholic schools are springing up all over the country during the past few decades—that of the Rt. Rev. Bernard J. McQuaid, Bishop of Rochester, N. Y. They were mainly poor and without influence. The anti-Catholic element was strong, fierce and active. Any priest certainly he exempted from the decree of the Baltimore Council concerning school building. But the young priest saw the need of a school, though school building and teachers were at first out of the question. He turned the priest's house into a school and himself became the teacher. Later he was the right hand of Bishop Bayley in founding a community of religious teachers and establishing a splendid system of parochial schools in the diocese of Newark, which then included the whole State of New Jersey. He was also founder and first president of St. Ann Hall College."

The Pilot then adds that there are now nearly 30,000 children in the Christian free schools of the two dioceses of Newark and Trenton, and that a few weeks ago Bishop McQuaid preached at the laying of the corner stone of a new and magnificent school in Morristown, where in the early days of the American church he gave such clear testimony of earnestness in the cause to which his life has been devoted. Of his later services the Pilot says:

"Appointed Bishop of Rochester in 1868, he found the new diocese, except for a few little academies in his episcopal city, destitute of schools. In the face of difficulties which would have deterred even a fairly resolute spirit, he set at repeating on a new field the work he had done so successfully in New Jersey; and in little more than 10 years the entire diocese was provided with free schools, which impartial judges have pronounced unsurpassed in America."

During this time his articles in the North American Review, the Journal of Education, the New York Independent, etc., attracted wide attention. He was looked to as the foremost exponent of popular education from the Catholic standpoint, and, in response to many and urgent invitations lectured on this theme in the principal cities of the Union.

Readers of the Pilot will remember his lecture, 10 years ago, in Boston, at the invitation of the Free Religious Association (Free Thinkers). He then expressed his conviction that the equitable

settlement of the school question would come from Boston and Massachusetts, which in the very outset of their history made religion the corner stone of education. The recent significant utterances of President Eliot, of Harvard University, and a prominent Boston newspaper's acknowledgment—quoted in a late issue of the Pilot—of reason in the Catholic demands, and the wisdom of conceding something to them, begin to give to the Bishop's words the prophetic aspect."

We in Canada who enjoy privileges in the matter of education not yet conceded to our brethren in the American republic, have not been listless observers of the fight in the good cause maintained by the Bishop of Rochester. We have in him seen a true champion of the faith. We have seen him meet every objection, overcome every hostile argument with a candor, a courage and a convincing power that endeared him to the Catholic multitudes and won him applause from bitter opponents. His written and his spoken word on behalf of the cause of truth, justice and equal rights, have now borne fruit. The Catholic claims in the matter of education are no longer met with scoff and flout and jibe. Thinking men, as the Pilot points out, are beginning to see that education without religion is a curse, not a blessing, and that if the republic is to endure God must not be kept out of the school-room, but his presence there made a living reality to win the youthful mind to virtue and thus to true citizenship.

TWO OF A KIND.

There is a brotherly feeling between anarchists everywhere. The Parisian municipal council and the general council of the Seine have been petitioning the people of the United States for the extension of clemency to the condemned Chicago anarchists. Anything more revoltingly impudent we can not call to mind in our recollections of public affairs. The anarchists of Chicago are red-handed murderers of the most atrocious character. In a free country that freely extends the rights, the privileges and the dignity of its citizenship to every foreigner, no matter what color a strange sun may have burnt on him—these men, who could easily have obtained work had they so willed, and for their work got adequate compensation, combined to lay waste a great city by murder and incendiarism. The American people are, if anything, lovers of law and order. They reaped and overcame a king because he outraged the fundamental principle of justice. They put down, at the cost of millions of dollars in money and of rivers of blood, a rebellion against their federal system. Could it then for one moment be imagined that they could for a single hour tolerate the violence of the Chicago anarchists? Could any man, knowing anything of American history or American love of order, believe that these anarchists, caught red-handed in their murderous deeds, could be permitted to escape condign punishment? The American nation owes it to itself and to the world to repress such disorder with a firm hand.

We are not surprised that the action of the Parisian municipal organizations—very hotbeds themselves of communistic disorder—has excited deep indignation among our republican neighbors. The Michigan Catholic very moderately and judiciously, but sternly voices the American sentiment on the subject:

"A majority of the men who compose the bodies in whose names this petition is sent to the people of the United States are of the scum of Paris; fellows who have no more regard for the laws that should prevail in a Christian country than has the King of Dahomey. One of them, and the most influential of the lot, on being asked why the city of Paris should interest itself in the case of the Chicago anarchist, answered, 'because we believe they acted as men according to their convictions.' That is, the Chicago anarchists had 'convictions' that they had the right to kill seven men, and because they acted 'according' to these convictions and killed the seven men, they did only what they had a right to do, therefore they committed no crime. But listen to what this fellow says further: 'They (the anarchists) may be right or they may be wrong, but as free, liberal, Republican Frenchmen we cannot see men who act according to the dictates of their own consciences condemned to death with supreme! Good heavens! Who but a Paris communist, a petroleur, an anarchist who has lost all notion of right and wrong, all sense of conscience, would claim the right of murder as an exercise of liberty of conscience? Had this Frenchman anything to do with sending New York her 'Statue of Liberty?'"

The Parisian communists may imagine that the rest of the world is filled with admiration for their theories, but if so America will soon undeceive them. The American people love liberty but loathe and condemn anarchy. France is to day the victims of administrative tyranny as despotic, as grinding, as odious and repulsive to every notion of true freedom as ever prevailed in ancient or modern times. She is but a republic in name, or sort of organized anarchy in which the aggressive few tyrannise over the submissive many. American freedom is something entirely different. It is

founded on the rule of the majority, and that majority obtained by free, unrestrained discussion of public affairs. America, in one word, is a free Christian country—France a despotically governed anti-Christian national existence.

THE CRISIS IN ENGLAND.

Lord Randolph Churchill's resignation has shaken and demoralized the Salisbury Cabinet. The latest intelligence at hand conveys us the information that the noble lord had on two occasions previous to his taking the final step decided to offer his resignation. The first time when Lord Iddesleigh was taking what is termed the most incredible step of despatching Condie Stephen, one of the hottest of English Russophobists, to Sofia, to urge the Bulgarians to resist Russia to the last, a course that would have led to a general European conflagration. The second time was when Lord Salisbury despatched a secret memorandum to Vienna offering a fighting alliance with Austria. The third time came when "honor and conscience both obliged Lord Randolph to retire from the government." The truth is that Lord Randolph Churchill could not brook following a leader at once so audacious in speech and so poverty-stricken and cowardly in action as the Marquis of Salisbury. The late Chancellor of the Exchequer felt that with the head of the house of Cecil as leader of the Tory party that political organization would be run on old lines, and after antique fashions, to its utter disability, a living independence factor in English modern politics. No sooner had Lord Randolph announced his fixed purpose of retirement, than the Marquis of Hartington, by whose good grace, as leader of the Liberal Unionists, the Tory government is enabled to drag out a palsied existence. He was, it appears, willing to relinquish the Premiership in Hartington's favor, but the latter could not see his way to become just now a Tory leader, and refused the doubtful and dangerous honor. He has, however, so far drifted from the Liberalism of the day that he must soon, if he remain in politics, find a resting place in Toryism. Salisbury was more successful with Mr. Goschen than with Hartington. The former has accepted the Chancellorship of the Exchequer and will contest the Exchange division of Liverpool for the Commons. He does not become leader of the House, that honor falling to the Right Hon. I. H. Smith, a sort of democratic Tory whose rise in the ranks of the aristocratic party is something phenomenal. The following brief notice now going the round of the daily press outlines his advancement to the front ranks in the Tory party:

Right Hon. Wm. Henry Smith, who has been called to the temporary leadership of the Conservatives in the House of Commons, made vacant by the resignation of Lord Randolph Churchill, is 61 years of age, having been born June 24, 1825. His father was the founder of the firm of W. H. Smith & Son, which enjoys a monopoly of all the news agencies of the English railway stations. His first position of prominence in politics was in July, 1865, when he was defeated as a Tory candidate for the Commons. Three years afterwards he defeated the eminent John Stewart Mill and has represented Westminister ever since 1868. In Feb., 1874, he was made financial secretary of the treasury in the Tory administration, and in August, 1877, was promoted to be first lord of the admiralty, going out of office upon the defeat of his party in 1880. He was again a short time in office in 1885, and upon the defeat of the Gladstone government at the general elections last summer returned to his post in the admiralty. Mr. Smith is popularly believed to be the original of "Sir Joseph Porter" in Gilbert and Sullivan's opera "Pinafore."

Mr. Smith, whatever his abilities, has certainly none of the high qualifications for leading a body like the English Commons, which made Lord Randolph's brief period of command such a conspicuous success. His appointment to the post is, therefore, a transparent makeshift, and proves the utter and pitiful poverty of the Tories in men of ability. The Chicago Times seems to have formed a correct appreciation of the crisis. It says:

"The fact of the matter appears to be that the Salisbury government is on its last legs. The withdrawal of Lord Randolph Churchill has weakened it seriously, and the indications are that the incongruous alliance of Tories and dissenting Liberals by which it has thus far been supported can not be much longer maintained. The orthodox Tories and the Hartingtonians are only in accord upon a single question of domestic policy, and it is impossible that all other issues should be held in abeyance for any length of time."

The Times further points out that "many important matters are pressing for parliamentary action as to which these two elements of the so-called government party are hopelessly at variance. The emergence of any of these questions, or of a crisis in the foreign relations of the empire, would almost inevitably involve a rupture, and the consequent downfall of the government. Negotiations have recently been resumed looking to a reunion of the Gladstonians and dissenting liberals, which at last accounts were

a very promising aspect. Mr. Gladstone is reported to be in a good mood, and Mr. Gladstone is willing to concede a good deal to win back the reconciliants."

But the most cheerless prospect the Tories lies in Lord Randolph's attitude towards his chief. The Times says that tude is an element in the boding no good to any one, presented as saying that the difference between the late Chancellor Premier are wider than have been supposed, and that these differences to almost every question of politics. The Times concludes by lowering observations:

"Altogether, the conservative position seems to be in a pretty bad way—in danger not only of losing its allies, but of a formidable defection of its ranks, led by Churchill, whose die-hard followers are understood to revolt. The general situation is chaotic as it well could be, strong probability is that Salisbury will be forced, at an early day, to the country. Indeed, it is not the preliminaries are already arranged for another general election very credible report in view of the difficulties and perplexities surround the government."

We see in the crisis elements for Ireland. Mr. Gladstone is the man of the house. The Tories are looking with longing for the grand old man, and willing that they should be the ranks. A London correspondent of the Liberalist writes:

"The air is full of talk of reconciliation and negotiation between the leaders of the two great parties. I am able to say that Mr. Gladstone's own private correspondence, the copy of which alone he will consent to give to the public, is upon the kind. First, the Rule Bill shall have precedence of Land bills; second, that an Irish body shall be established subordinate to the Imperial in any way that is deemed but with power to legislate declared to be exclusively the executive Government of Ireland. From this it is evident that Chamberlain's speech at Bristol received no warmer welcome than from Mr. Gladstone than from Mr. Chamberlain's own Unionist friends. I described by his friends as very bad temper, and detestable no further advances."

The Freeman's Journal justly affirms the adhesion of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain to the Liberal party will be of the value of the Irish policy of an Irish Parliament. Irish leaders will never, as he affirms, sanction such a basis of their rights. Ireland may system of Home Rule that will Rule not in name only but Home Rule that will restore perity and to the empire secure Rule that will make of England nations all over the world peoples rivaling each other in peaceful arts of Christian civilization."

THE LATE JAMES A. McMASTER.

The James A. McMaster, York Freeman's Journal, a man of grasp and herculean strength, to lead his followers, Mr. Chamberlain throughout a long and busy church and country services which it is impossible to content of which it were idle to describe. He was one of the great men raised up at a critical moment in the history of the church which required men of mild temper to lay on a solid basis of an enduring Christian civilization. McMaster seemed fully to understand the importance of the situation. Constancy, perseverance, firmness, all crowned with humility, these were among the qualities which marked, distinguished his long, busy life. How true the appreciative struggle uttered by F. G. S. J.

"Endowed as he was with extraordinary powers, which were trained and developed in a free by careful habits of discipline, he was peculiarly with the great exigencies of the time which affected the opinion that affected the time he assumed control of the paper with which so long he was honorably associated. His power was maintained. The orthodox Tories and the Hartingtonians are only in accord upon a single question of domestic policy, and it is impossible that all other issues should be held in abeyance for any length of time."

The Times further points out that "many important matters are pressing for parliamentary action as to which these two elements of the so-called government party are hopelessly at variance. The emergence of any of these questions, or of a crisis in the foreign relations of the empire, would almost inevitably involve a rupture, and the consequent downfall of the government. Negotiations have recently been resumed looking to a reunion of the Gladstonians and dissenting liberals, which at last accounts were

Born April 1st, 1820, at Schenectady County, N. Y. McMaster was the second son of the Rev. Gilbert McMaster, eminent Presbyterian divine at Union College. Mr. McMaster early age, devoted his attention