

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITOR—REV. GEO. R. NORTHGRAVES,

Author of "Mistakes of Modern Ireland."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor.

Messrs. DONAT CROWE, LUKE KING and JOHN NICH are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the Catholic Record.

Agent for Ottawa—P. J. Coffey, Esq.

Agent for Alexandria, Glenora and London—Mr. Donald A. McDonald.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion.

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

All correspondence on business should be addressed to the Proprietor.

Persons writing for a change of address should invariably send the name of their former post office.

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., Sept. 8th. 1888.

WHERE IS THE LIBERTY OF SPEECH?

A meeting was arranged to be held in Ballinasloe on the 15th ult., for the purpose of protesting against the supererogation of the elected guardians by a Government Board. The Government, however, will not allow any word to be spoken against its action, the meeting was proclaimed, and a large force of police was sent to the spot to prevent any assembly. However, the people were determined to exercise their right of free speech, and Messrs. Harris and Sheehy, M. P.s, with Father Costello, waited on Mr. Byrne, Divisional Magistrate, with a copy of the resolutions which were to be placed before the meeting. Notwithstanding that the proposed resolutions were perfectly legal and consisted merely of a protest against the high-handed proceedings of the Government, Mr. Byrne declared that he would hold no parley, and that he would not allow any meeting to be held. The members of Parliament and others then proceeded to take possession of the platform, in order to assert their right of free speech, even in criticising the acts of Government, but they were dispersed by the police.

By such brutal methods as this Ireland is governed, and though there is no law, even Coercion law, against the holding of such meetings as it was here proposed to hold, the inalienable rights of the public were trampled on by the police with impunity, knowing that their conduct would be upheld by the Chief Secretary, who undoubtedly had even given directions that this, or similar meetings should be suppressed. On the very day that these tyrannical proceedings were going on, Mr. Balfour was visiting the Dublin Constabulary depot, and in a harangue addressed to the force comprised the body of Irish constabulary as being most attentive to their duties, and the mainstay of loyalty in the country, without whom it would be impossible to preserve law and order. Yet it is a fact that so wonderfully peaceful are the people, that almost all the breaches of law and order are perpetrated by the police and the magistracy.

It is scarcely necessary to add that the duties to which the police are so attentive as to gain the commendation of the Chief Secretary, consists in evicting tenants by means of battering-ram and baton, dispersing public meetings, and preventing free speech, as on the present occasion, with murders from time to time, at Mitchells-town, and the arresting of respectable people, with all the circumstances of outrage and brutality, which their immunity from punishment or even reprimand suggests to them. This is what is meant by law and order in Ireland.

IRISH LOYALTY.

A band from Cork refused, when requested so to do, to play "God save the Queen" at the Irish Exhibition in London. They were hissed by the audience. The leader stated that if they did the like they need not return to their homes. On their arrival home on the 28th ult. they were received with an ovation. When their steamer passed the British flag-ship Revenge, the band of the Revenge played "God save the Queen," and the Cork band played "God save Ireland" in response. The latter band has been dubbed by many journals "the rebellious Irish band," in consequence of their action. As long as Ireland is governed by throwing her most respected citizens and her Parliamentary representatives into prison, by torturing them to death, and by bludgeoning and shooting the people with her Majesty's presumed approval, for attending lawful public meetings, it would be absurd to expect Irish bands or other Irish organizations to overflow with loyalty to the Queen. A little justice shown to Ireland by her rulers would tend more to make the Irish people loyal, than years of Balfourian misrule and oppression.

Thackeray makes one of his heroes say: "Most of the low fellows enlisted with myself were, of course, Papists, (the English army was filled with such, out of that never-failing country of ours!)" That is to say, the soldiers who fought England's battles on the continent were Irishmen: but it is certain this will not be the case hereafter, unless there be a

great change in the way of governing that long suffering country.

The prison discipline alone under which the men whom the Irish people delight to honor with their confidence and affection, are treated with both cruelty and indignity, is enough to drive every sentiment of loyalty to the throne of England out of Irishmen's hearts. Mr. Wilfred Blunt recently proved the direct responsibility of the Chief Secretary for the manner in which his victims are treated, and we know that not long since the Queen lauded Mr. Balfour and his policy. As long as Her Majesty thus assumes the responsibility for the cruelties practiced in Ireland, it is scarcely reasonable to expect that Irish organizations like the Cork band will be effusive in loyal manifestations, and they may be very well excused for refusing to make them.

Mr. Blunt shows that even the manifestation of ordinary humanity by a prison official toward a political prisoner is punished by the Irish Executive with the surest severity. He says:

"Of the six officers most directly responsible for my disciplinary treatment, five have, to my knowledge, incurred punishment. Captain Mason, the Governor of Galway Jail, an easy-going man, who relaxed the rules in my favor, has been required to leave the service. Chief Warden Grant has been degraded in rank, reduced in pay, and removed to a convict prison. Warden Denby, especially in charge of me, has been dismissed, and two other wardens connected with me have been fined and reprimanded." And he adds, "I have no doubt whatever that their humanity to me was the prime cause of their disgrace."

It is a disgrace to the people of England that to the man who is responsible for this state of affairs a position is given which gives him the power of life and death, and loyalty cannot be expected from a nation over whom such an autocrat is placed. We have no doubt that under other circumstances the people of Ireland would be loyal enough, but as matters stand it is preposterous to expect this to be the case.

Atlantic cable despatches state that United Ireland commends the conduct of the Cork band. It adds: "Only hypocrites and sycophants repay neglect and cold aversion with a semblance of enthusiastic personal loyalty."

WHITENWASHING A RACK RENTER

An effort is being made to make it appear that Lord Lansdowne is a model landlord, and that his estates are admirably managed for the welfare of the tenants. The following has been telegraphed to the press of this country per Atlantic cable: "Lord and Lady Lansdowne have been paying a visit to Derrin, their place in Kerry. I am pleased to hear that Lord Lansdowne's tenants have given him a most cordial reception. Mr. O'Brien's mission to Canada to damage Lord Lansdowne was hardly a greater failure than the working of the Plan of Campaign in Kerry. The well-to-do tenants, who were perfectly able to pay rent, but who allowed themselves to be evicted because of their terror of the National League, would rejoice if they could get back to their excellent farms on this liberally-managed property."

This lame attempt to whitewash his Lordship will scarcely deceive even the most credulous, though, of course, he will continue to be the idol of Canadian Orangemen, not because he is supposed to be a good landlord, but precisely because he is known to be a tyrant and a friend to the most oppressive Government in Ireland since the sanctionless Cromwell ruled. The evictor of Luggacurran is just such a landlord as these praters about civil and religious liberty delight to contemplate.

The cruel evictions on Lord Lansdowne's estate, where the crowbar was used with all the barbarity anywhere exhibited, are not forgotten, and this where the improvements belonged to the tenants themselves. The case of Mr. Whelan on Lord Lansdowne's estates is but a sample of hundreds of cases. In Mr. Whelan's case it happened that, favorable as is the law to the landlords, Lord Lansdowne went even beyond its provisions and was forced to disgorge £70 damages inflicted on his tenant. This was compensation for a forge, the property of the tenant, which he had unjustly seized, and which even the landlord-favoring law would not allow him to retain. Among all the rack-renters who have inflicted wrong upon Irish tenants, none have been more unrelenting than Lord Lansdowne—whom a late writer in one of the Toronto papers describes as a most benignant landlord. Mr. Wm. O'Brien did this much while he was in Canada: by calling attention to Lord Lansdowne's cruelties, he tore from him the mask behind which he was serenading in Canada as a model landlord much loved by an admiring tenantry. No one denounced more strongly than Professor Stuart, M. P., Lord Lansdowne's tyranny, and when lately the Presbyterian clergyman, Rev. Mr. Irwin, visited Canada, he declared that Mr. Wm. O'Brien's description of Lord Lansdowne fell far short of the heartrending acts of oppression which were perpetrated by him. Rev. Mr. Irwin comes from the spot where these occurred, and certainly his testimony cannot be im-

peached. Nor has Lord Lansdowne's conduct been improved even since the scathing exposures made by Mr. O'Brien. The barbarous evictions in Luggacurran last October and January are perfectly on a par with those which took place at Bodke and Glensharrold, or these which are now going on on Col. Vardaleur's estate.

As Wm. O'Brien said in Montreal: "There is not a man in Canada, whatever his race, and whatever his creed, who reverences freedom and justice and truth, but who believes in his secret heart that Lord Lansdowne is guilty of the inhumanity we have accused him of. It is not a laughing matter for the poor five hundred homeless people in Luggacurran whose sufferings are on his head." By the subsequent evictions the number of sufferers is largely increased.

NEPOTISM IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

The right of certain wealthy aristocrats to present whom they wish for livings in the Church of England, is one of the blessings resulting from the recognition of the Queen instead of the Pope in the Church of England. This, of course, makes the Church of England very dear to the aristocracy—and dear also to the people who are compelled to pay tithes for the enjoyment of spiritual consolation meted out by the sons of nobility who get the fat livings, while paying poor curates a miserable pittance for doing the work. The Marquis of Salisbury has just given to his son, the Rev. Lord Gascoyne Cecil, a rich living at Hatfield, to which is attached an income of £2,000. There are two churches in the parish, and the curate who attends one of them gets the magnificent salary of £100.

A PAN-ANGLICAN ECYECICAL.

A letter has been issued by the Pan-Anglican Council which recently closed its sessions at Lambeth Palace in London. In imitation of the Pope, who really addresses the whole world, having the authority conferred by Christ to "teach all nations," the Pan-Anglicans have dignified their letter with the name "Ecycical." It is called by them "the Lambeth Ecycical."

The absurdity of calling such a document an Ecycical is apparent, for notwithstanding the fact that Protestantism has endeavored to make use of the term for a common circular letter, both etymology and usage confine its meaning to a document addressed to the Christian world by one who has the right to speak with authority, and as such it must be received with due respect by all. Is the Lambeth Ecycical of this character? When the Pan-Anglican Council was convened it was expressly stipulated that it had no authority to decide doctrinal disputes. The Ecycical does touch upon doctrinal matters, and does explicitly or implicitly define certain points, but by so doing it acknowledges that it interferes in matters over which it has no control. On the other hand, there are matters of vital importance to the Church which are ominously passed over without the remotest reference being made to them.

If any proof were needed for this self-evident truth, such is furnished by a letter written by the Bishop of Liverpool to the Times of 16th August. The bishop totally repudiates any authority in the so-called Ecycical. He declares that he "does not pretend to criticize it," but it is not "the formal, deliberate, unanimous opinion of all the 145 bishops who attended the so-called Pan-Anglican Conference." He adds: "I must disclaim any responsibility for its contents." He declares that himself had no hand in drawing it up, neither did he see any rough draft of it after it was drawn up, nor did he "read a line of it before it appeared in the columns of the Times." He adds that there are things in it which he does not approve, and while he leaves us to understand that there are many glaring defects, he specifies one such which he "cannot refrain from deploring." That defect is the conspicuous absence of any reference to the unhappy divisions about the doctrine and ritual of the Lord's Supper which are at this moment convulsing the Church of England, and will certainly bring on disruption and disestablishment unless they are healed. The existence and formidable nature of these divisions it is vain to deny. To my eyes they are of more cardinal importance and appear to require far more attention than the condition of the Scandinavian or Greek Churches, or the Old Catholic movement.

The Archbishop of Canterbury, in a subsequent letter which appeared in the Times of the 18th August, expresses regret that the Bishop of Liverpool did not make his suggestions for additions at the conference rather than afterwards, but he maintains that the Ecycical was discussed, paragraph by paragraph, in conference, and that all the bishops were present except a few, eight he believes, who were absent through sickness or other causes. This is very probably correct, but it does not at all affect the main point to which the Bishop of Liverpool calls attention, which is that the conference evaded dealing with most important doctrinal matters, through

fear of exposing to the world the sadly disunited condition in which the Church stands between the High and Low, Erastian and Latitudinarian parties which distract her, and which are as distinct from one another as the most extreme sects into which Protestantism is divided. Nothing could show more plainly than this the absolute impotency of the Church of England and all its offshoots to fulfil the object for which the Church was established on earth by Christ; "that henceforth we be no more children tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine by the wickedness of men, by cunning craftiness by which they lie in wait to deceive." (Eph. iv., 14.)

The Bishop specifies some particular matters on which a definite declaration should have been made, and certainly the omission to make such definite statement is an admission that there is no power in the Church to preserve Unity of Faith. The points specially pointed out by the bishop are given in this paragraph: "Some expression of humble regret for these divisions, some strong desire for properly defined conditions of peace, some proposal to attempt the restoration of godly discipline and the creation of satisfactory Ecclesiastical courts, some bold declaration that, with the utmost degree of toleration, our Church will never re-admit the Mass and auricular confession, or go behind the Reformation; a few plain statements of this kind would have immensely improved the Ecycical, greatly strengthened the Church of England, and cheered the hearts of myriads of loyal churchmen. Alas, about all these points the Ecycical is painfully silent. Against that silence I enter my solemn protest."

The Conference evidently aimed at making an outward show of unity where unity is not. Composed as it was of churches totally distinct from and independent of each other, without any Supreme Head, it could not issue any decree on any of these subjects which would bind the churches represented in it. If such a decree had been issued, it would only have succeeded in making manifest its essentially divided condition.

In spite of all this the Conference declared that the Church is One! The fallacy of its claim would have been apparent to the most blind, if it had attempted to deal with the questions enumerated by the Bishop of Liverpool, and it took the only course by which the delusive claim of Unity could be kept up, namely, by keeping its divisions hidden behind the curtain of absolute silence.

In addition to the claim of Unity for the Church of England, the Conference also claims that it is "Catholic" and "Apostolic." It is scarcely necessary for us to show, what has been so often proved, that it is neither one nor the other. The jurisdiction of a Church to be Catholic must extend over the whole world. The title of the Church to the mark of Catholicity arises chiefly from the words of our Lord, St. Matt. xxviii., 20: "Teach ye all nations. . . . teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world." A three-fold Catholicity is hereby made characteristic of the Church: Catholicity of place, of doctrine, and of time. The Church of England is essentially National. It is English, and not Catholic or Universal. This is implied in her very name, and the recognized standard of the Church of England doctrine expressly sets forth its purely National character when it declares, and requires its clergy to swear, that no foreign prelate hath or ought to have jurisdiction in the realm. This would exclude the Apostles from preaching the Gospel in England or her colonies, and it excludes all successors of the Apostles from doing the same.

If no foreigner can possess ecclesiastical jurisdiction in England, no foreigner can confer it. Now the Church of England claims that all its ecclesiastical jurisdiction is in some way derived from some successors of the Apostles, foreigners as they were. Hence the prelates of the English Church derive all their jurisdiction, according to their own theory, from those who could not confer it, and it must be null and void, not only in other countries, but in England itself. How a Church can be Catholic which has no jurisdiction either at home or abroad it is difficult to see.

The Catholicity of doctrine of the Church requires that she teach all that Christ taught. The silence of the Pan-Anglican Conference in regard to the important matters enumerated by the Bishop of Liverpool proves that the Church lacks Catholicity in this respect also; and as to Catholicity of time, it would be requisite that she should have an existence at least, in order to possess this. Now we all know that until Henry VIII. established his supremacy, the Church of England, as we now understand the words, had no existence whatever. Some members of that Church attempt by a play upon words to make it appear that she existed before Henry VIII., because a Church of England was sometimes spoken of before that time. But whenever such an expression was used it referred to the portion of the Church Catholic or Universal which was

in England, and which was certainly in communion with the Pope and which acknowledged him as its Supreme Head on earth. This is something very different from our conception of the modern Church of England.

We have said enough to show the fallacy of the Pan-Anglican claim to Apostolicity. We may add that the Church of England which possessed Apostolicity was that one which existed before the Reformation, and which could point to its line of Bishops, which through St. Augustine held its ecclesiastical authority from Rome, the centre of Catholic unity. Christ founded only one church, and any other than the one which He established is but a delusion. This is the position which the Anglican Church occupies, a position from which a thousand Pan-Anglican Conferences cannot deliver it. The Conference or Council occupies a very similar position to that of a certain Episcopal, or Pan-Anglican Bishop of Kentucky, who ignored the dissensions with which his diocese was torn. No one was able to discover with which party his sympathies were enlisted, until a lady took occasion to ask him: "Bishop, what are your views? We cannot find out. Are you High Church or Low Church?" The Bishop's reply was: "Madam, I am High, Low, Jack and the Game." By this non-committal policy harmony was secured, and the Pan-Anglican Council hopes to secure harmony by following a similar course.

The sanctity and indissolubility of the marriage tie is one of the few doctrinal subjects on which the Lambeth Ecycical dares to speak positively. This is a very delicate subject for Anglicans to deal with, for though there is a pretty fair unanimity among modern Anglicans in favor of the indissolubility of marriage, it was not always so. The world cannot readily forget that it was the lust of Henry VIII., and his wish to obtain a divorce from Queen Catharine, that caused him to establish a new Church. The Pope was too fixed in his adherence to the ancient traditions of the Church, which maintained that marriage cannot be dissolved except by death, and this led Henry to establish a Church, which would be more pliable, one whose doctrines he could control, and the Church of England was the result, over which the king himself was declared the Supreme Head. Nor, indeed, was the Church of England alone in permitting the marriage tie to be dissolved. The heads of the Reformation on the Continent all agreed to permit a German Prince, the Landgrave of Hesse, marry a second time while his first wife was living, and signed a document to this effect, this being the only way to secure his firm adherence to their cause. The sanctity of marriage is far from being a specially Protestant doctrine.

FANATICISM AT A DISCOUNT.

The Boston fanatics who assembled in Faneuil Hall to declare war to the knife against Catholics, and who declared that a Catholic is necessarily anti-American, have been several times taken to task by the *Christian Register*, which nobly refuses to be dragged in the mire of bigotry by the Baptist and other clergy who engineered the Faneuil Hall and Tremont Temple meetings. This journal, thoroughly Protestant as it is, thus speaks of General Sheridan, whose name the fanatics blessed when it was mentioned at the meetings above referred to: "That an Irishman and a Catholic may be a good citizen, worthy of the love, honor and reverence of his fellow citizens, is shown in the great career of Philip H. Sheridan, and the universal respect of the nation manifested at his death and burial. Among all the notices of his career, we have seen not one hint of any prejudice against him because he was a member of the Catholic Church. His patriotism was so simple, so sincere, so enthusiastic, his services to the republic were so great and so brilliant, the confidence in him shared by such leaders as Lincoln, Grant, and Sherman was so marked and explicit, that there was no room for adverse criticism. Philip Sheridan, Irishman and Catholic, is a typical American hero, and his example will lead many a young foreigner to emulate his record of patriotic service."

"AN UNPARALLELED SACRILEGE."

A strange request was made by the American consul to the President and Cabinet of the little Republic of San Domingo, which is strikingly illustrative of American enterprise and aptitude for devising plans to raise the wind, though on this occasion the plan did not take. The tomb of Christopher is in San Domingo, but of course only the bones of the great discoverer are left. A Mr. Linnell, who is an American citizen, concluded that if he could secure the bones, and exhibit them through the country, charging everywhere a small admission fee, he would be able to amass thereby a considerable fortune. Laying the matter before the resident American Consul, he induced this functionary to write to the Government of San Domingo, requesting that the bones should be exhumed, and that a number of Priests and Dominican friars should accompany them as a guard, dressed in full ecclesiastical costume, exhibiting the bones throughout the United

States under Mr. Linnell's direction, Mr. Linnell guaranteeing to pay to the Government one-half of the proceeds of the exhibition, the exhibition to be continued for four years.

President Hecareux and the Cabinet replied through the Secretary of State that such a proposition could not be entertained by the Government, as they regarded it as an "unparalleled sacrilege." They therefore declined to comply with the extraordinary request. Mr. Linnell will therefore have to think of some other mode of making his millions.

"THE FRENCH QUESTION."

This is the title of a neat pamphlet of eighty-seven pages, issued by Mr. Joseph Tase, editor of the *Minerva*, and composed of a series of letters addressed to the editor of the *Mail*, being a reply to the persistent attacks of that journal upon the French-Canadian population of Canada.

Our readers will remember that towards the close of 1887 Mr. Tase answered the venomous attack of a pretended Protestant minister of Montreal upon the people of the Province of Quebec. On the appearance of Mr. Tase's first letter the Protestant minister disappeared from the arena, and the *Mail*, identifying itself with the now invisible minister, continued the controversy on his behalf. Four letters of Mr. Tase's appeared in the *Mail*, accompanied with hostile comments of the editor, who has now for two or three years been endeavoring to excite the people of Ontario and the Protestants of Quebec against the French Canadian fellow citizens of the latter Province. But in Mr. Tase's editor of the *Mail* found an antagonist not easily vanquished. The fallacy of the *Mail*'s arguments was thoroughly exposed, and the evil results of this race war which that journal was endeavoring to enkindle was pointed out so forcibly that the fifth letter of Mr. Tase was pigeon-holed by that journal for over a month, while keeping Mr. Tase always in expectation that it would be published "next Saturday."

Mr. Tase then made use of the columns of the *Empire*, in which he continued his subject. The letters are now published in pamphlet form, and they constitute an invaluable treatise on a subject to which the *Mail* has given great prominence as a leading question of the day.

There is in reality no such critical question before the people of the Dominion as "How are the French-Canadians to be dealt with?" The French-Canadians owe their origin to France, it is true, but Canada was won by British arms in 1763, and was formally ceded with honorable conditions to the vanquished. More than three generations have passed away since that date, and, though French in origin, the people of Quebec have proved themselves thoroughly loyal to the regime under which they were born, equally with the most English of their fellow-subjects. The Catholic religion has enjoyed full freedom since at least 1774, and there is nothing to alienate the population of French origin from their loyalty to Great Britain; nor is there likely to be, unless such persecution be attempted as the *Mail* has been endeavoring to excite. That journal has frequently acknowledged that its efforts to excite religious and race rancor are not likely to prove successful; still there are always to be found in a large community a domineering class who are not satisfied with the equality which the law accords, but would fain establish an ascendancy over their neighbors. Such a class the *Mail* has appealed to, and in order that their efforts at dominancy may not succeed it is necessary, in a free country, to meet their arguments with courage. This Mr. Tase has done in the pamphlet before us in a conciliatory yet dignified and vigorous manner.

The *Mail* complains bitterly of the Quebec Tithe system. Mr. Tase shows that Jean Baptiste is quite content with this manner of supporting the Church. He quotes on this point the admirable words used by Sir John Macdonald in this city on the 16th September, 1886, precisely in answer to the *Mail*'s complaints. Sir John said:

"The French-Canadians of Quebec have their own religion and their own Legislature. Why should we interfere in any way with them? A man, if he be a Catholic, gives a certain proportion of his crops to the priest of his parish. A certain portion of his grain only, mind you. If he raises roots or hay or cattle, he pays no tithes, and if he chooses to turn Protestant he need not pay tithes any more. (Laughter.) The people of the agricultural districts have more crops than cash, and it is convenient for them to pay their tithes in the produce of their crops rather than subscribe and pay in cash. That is their system, and they like it, and it is a system of which Protestants cannot complain, as they have nothing to do with it. And if these people do not complain of it, why should we, in another Province, with different institutions, try to force our opinions upon a point of that kind. I disapprove it altogether, altogether. I think it is desirable that I should say this." (Cheers.)

Nothing need be added to this. It refutes the *Mail*'s grievance completely.

Another of the *Mail*'s grievances is that upon fifteen years, have been by degrees deprived of their rightful share of representation in municipal and legislative

matters, in our law courts and municipal offices."

Mr. Tase shows that the present time as it is past. The people of always acted towards the greatest liberality French Protestants are to Parliament for Catholic. In 1867, just before Confederation, 3146 English French-speaking officials time when Ontario had from end to end with the French were dominant. The official shows 825 French employment Government to 3000 under the Government same year there were 10 employees, with salaries \$285,379, and seventy with salaries amounting the English-speaking 29.8 per cent. in the and they receive 32.9 salaries, while they are 21 per cent. of the population being at the last census whom 255,207 were other origin.

Does this look like English?

Mr. Tase adds: In the Legislature of the Dominion French-speaking minority represented by one Federal four, six senators over eleven members of the House of sixty-five. I minority of the other handsomely treated; a postal guide. . . there vince of Quebec 1357 p which 895 are held by and 552 by English speaks does not look like ostracism. Legislature there are several Legislative Council four, and thirteen members Assembly out of six.

Many other facts point conclusion are mentioned subject on which the *Mail* a complaint, Mr. Tase triumphant answer. pamphlet to the careful readers.

THE RETALIATION.

In reference to the tion Bill, which is now and the message of President Cleveland there are some points on which the bill proposes the London Times says:

"We ventured to present that President Cleveland only serve to stiffen Canadian Ministers. We of the mark. The first of members of the Cabinet may cause the President how wantonly he has been treated by the two great Americas for an injustice. So far from flinching from Canada courts it, looking to see is whether Government will take this double-edged weapon of their own make. The remarks that the Minister definite information as of the Government. It also considers that policy of the States is come to grief without hand against it, because and importance of the that would be damaged."

The Times says also:

"Canada may certainly reprisals affecting tenants will arouse a great class large population dependent prosperity of certain A retaliation will likely upon some such rock as Canadians lifting a hand."

We think it will be does not "count" any such If our American neighbors on Commercial non-interference not give ourselves up to are to be denied commerce we shall try to exist think we can do so.

There is no doubt the majority in the Senate Fisheries Treaty through motive of embarrassment land. The Treaty gave nearly all they asked counter-move on the part the President seeks to means in showing hostility Canada. It is still doubtful Republicans will put President Cleveland through. For they are disposed he has made of the power which he already holds, extension, and even if it be passed, it is not unlikely to be amended that after the coming election may not be President Boston *Advertiser* thus whole storm originates two great parties to over.

"If Mr. Cleveland, in most sacred obligations officers to advance his position he has shifted his attitude other great public question to get votes for a second