

thought, of the condition of this Society, we are taken completely aback by the present statement, for we have been under the impression that while the American Board had too many men for its means, the London Missionary Society had too much money for its men. Shall not our Canadian Foreign Missionary contributions be sent in that direction? The Australian churches have thrown themselves very heartily into the work.

REV. J. T. BYRNE.—We are glad to hear that Mr. Byrne has the prospect of making £1,000 in Britain for the French Canadian Missionary Society. He has been greatly aided by two “drawing room meetings,” arranged for him in London and Edinburgh, by Joseph Mackay, Esq., of Montreal.

PARLIAMENTARY PROCEEDINGS.

THE NESTORIANS IN PERSIA.—In the House of Lords, on the 8th May, Lord Stratford de Redcliffe brought forward the case of the persecution of the Nestorians by the Mussulman subordinates of the Persian Government, and the Catholics. The American Missionaries among this people have frequently acknowledged their great indebtedness to the representatives of Her Majesty at the Court of Persia, and it now appears from Lord Clarendon's statement that in consequence of the intervention of the present agent of the British Government, the Shah had appointed a Christian Ruler over the Nestorians, had given them a site for a church, and £100 towards the cost of building it. The British Government had directed £80 to be given to the erection of the church. All sects had joined Mr. Allison in the subscription. Her Majesty personally desired that Mr. Allison should seek an audience with the Shah, to express in her name the interest she took in these questions, and her warm acknowledgments for the Shah's valuable assistance and the protection extended to the Nestorians.

A very good example, say we, of the *right* way for a Queen to be a “nursing mother” to the church.

CHURCH RATES—MR. GLADSTONE ON MR. MORLEY.—The Chancellor of the Exchequer, in introducing a bill embodying the proposal which he made some time since for settling the church rate question—a proposal which is accepted by the Liberation Society, and seems likely to commend itself to reasonable men on the other side,—spoke these emphatic words in relation to Mr. Morley, which abundantly prove that the loss of his seat has not only left his honour unimpeached among his co-religionists, but has not lowered him in the eyes of a man of such scrupulous conscience as Mr. Gladstone:

“I communicated with another honourable member, whose absence from the House I deplore on personal as well as on public grounds. I allude to Mr. Morley, in whose removal from Parliament I think we have experienced a serious loss, not only because of the respect in which he is held for his intelligence and talents, but also on account of the singularly conciliatory manner in which he is accustomed to express the most strongly pronounced opinions of Dissenters, and of the determination which he at all times exhibited here of never entering into a controversy except for some vital object.”

Yet this same Mr. Morley has been the *lête noir* of the High Church party, the embodiment of the most “rabid” Dissent. How changed a man seems, when we know him!