

great Anglo-Saxon nations, and the prospects of the settlement of international difficulties by Arbitration instead of War,—that we cannot pass it by. We confess that we are surprised at the coolness with which even our religious contemporaries on the other side of the line speak of these claims, as never expected to be allowed by the Arbitrators. But if just, why have they not some chance to be allowed? And if not just, how can Christian men be content to have them preferred? It seems to us that there is a sad want of self-respect in such an attitude on the part of a great nation. And how monstrous and absurd does it not appear when the fact comes out that during the Franco-Prussian War the United States Government was itself selling muskets and making cartridges for the French, while at peace with Germany, and a “neutral!”

The Nonconformists of England have now fairly broken with Mr. Gladstone's Government, on the Education Question. Mr. Forster's Act of 1870 was bad enough, in its favour to denominational schools; but the spirit in which it is administered is still more exasperating. The demand now made is for a purely “secular” system of public instruction, leaving the religious element to be supplied by parents and churches. The great Nonconformist Educational Conference in Manchester, on the — January, at which upwards of eighteen hundred delegates were present, fairly and squarely planted itself on this ground.

One strong argument for this position is this, that the Government cannot proceed upon opposite principles, in the different parts of the United Kingdom. The Catholic Hierarchy are pressing hard for an entirely denominational system in Ireland; and if such a system is upheld in England, a very powerful weapon is put in their hands.

We are glad to see that Mr Gladstone has given a positive answer on one question, on which his Administration was supposed to be rather shaky. He will *not* grant a charter to a Catholic University for Ireland. The laity, as appears by the failure of a recent meeting called for the purpose, do not rally round Archbishop Cullen on this question, as his Grace expected.

The Woman Question has troubled our Conservative Presbyterian friends in the States not a little. Dr. Cuyler invited a Quakeress to preach for him, and the session and congregation approved! The Brooklyn Presbytery was hastily summoned to deal with the offender, but no sentence of condemnation was passed; the churches generally were simply admonished to observe the rule of the Assembly, in 1832, forbidding such practices. The general feeling is evidently with Dr. Cuyler, who regarded this case as altogether exceptional, the lady preacher in question having special gifts of persuasive speech, and being a godly, modest woman, whose words have done much good. Would any of us put our hand on the mouth of Elizabeth Fry?

The *Advance* appears to make good its position, by the testimony of the Moderator of the Council, President Sturtevant, Dr. Quint, and others, that the “doctrinal basis” was correctly represented by it in the first instance. It is to be noted, however, that every one almost of those so contending explicitly disclaims Arminianism for himself,—Dr. Patton, Dr. Bacon, and all. The following is from the *Advance* itself (Jan. 25):—*Zion's Herald* says: “Our Calvinistic friends had better own that Calvinism is dead, and that Arminianism killed it.” The difficulty we find in the way of “owning” any such alleged fact is, that it *isn't true!* The Presbyterians, the Baptists, the Congregationalists, and many of the Low Church Episcopalians, are Calvinists in actual sentiment, whether their church tests require it or not; and we have no knowledge of any tendency to distinctive Arminian doctrines. With all our own liberality toward our Methodist brethren, we could not possibly adopt their explanations of Scripture, while we should almost as soon think of practicing “falling from grace” as believing in it!