

the pious element in a British community, the keeping up of the divine service in its sacredness, and in the observance of the Sabbath, which is disregarded in many other supposed enlightened countries."—Was Baron Von Mueller's meaning that of pointing out a blemish in the educational institutions to which he referred?—If, on the contrary, as the report would seem to convey, the Baron's suggestion was that the better state of things he advocated could be combined with the educational institutions of the country as they now exist, the confusion of his ideas is evident. Are not the irreligious conditions in other countries, and of which Baron Von Mueller complains, based on and supported by just such educational institutions as New Zealand possesses? Vines of the same kind cannot bear poisonous berries in France or Italy and wholesome grapes in New Zealand. We admit, however, that the Baron's intention may have been to point out the crying defect. If so, it is a pity he did not express himself a little more clearly. Or is it that he has been negligently reported?

RATHER a grim illustration of the existence of one **A GRAVE CASE**, law for the rich man and another for the poor man is that which has occurred in connection with the death of the Duke of Bedford. His Grace, we are told, in a paroxysm of pain, shot himself through the heart in the presence of two attendants. His body, nevertheless, was cremated—according to directions previously given by him—either without the holding of an inquest, or after an inquest had been secretly held. The case is a melancholy one, and not much good is to be got by discussing its details. For any unfortunate being, be he duke or peasant, driven beside himself with pain, and putting an end to his life in desperation, pity may be claimed, and silence may be the best way in which it can be shown. The important point, however, is that the body of this suicide was hurried out of sight and destroyed, compliance with the provisions of the law being neglected altogether, or insufficiently made, and that is where the difference comes in. Certainly the circumstances attendant on the suicide of one who had filled a less exalted situation would have been different. All the particulars would have been examined into and all the details, however squalid, would have been made public—perhaps to no good end, and possibly to a very bad one—but that is not now our subject. It is, in fact, evident that, notwithstanding all the boasts of democratic feeling and of the power of the people, high caste still holds sway in England. This instance of the Duke of Bedford's suicide is not the only one in which we have more recently seen proofs of this. It may, indeed, appear to some a little matter that a noble family should be allowed to defend themselves against a galling and perhaps injurious publicity. The evidence, however, of the influence of the great houses is of serious consequence. We may be convinced that it is felt also in matters that gravely concern the public interests, and, while this continues to be the case, popular Government must be more or less a vain and delusive appearance. Not, therefore, merely for the sake of vindicating the behests of the law in one particular instance—which might perhaps be overlooked, but in order to strike a blow at a power that militates against the progress and welfare of the country, it is to be hoped the case in question will be thoroughly sifted, and their fault brought home to those who are accountable.

HERE is another grain of comfort. Lord Salisbury, **HANSHON-ON**, at the re-opening of the Imperial Parliament, has denied that a dissolution is impending. Possibly the bye-election at Hartlepool has had some part in his Lordship's denial. There is no chance apparent, then, of taking the country at a moment of panic—worked up, for instance, by the fine indignation of the Tory papers at the fall of Mr. Parnell. Lord Salisbury's denial is more significant than a whole volume of minute explanations respecting the attitude of the people might be. He looks upon the vital interests of his party and his class as at stake, and it is a matter of life and death for him to understand the popular mind. The announcement of a dissolution just now would mean that the Tories saw a very fair chance, and something even more than that, of renewing their strength and prolonging their term of office, of being sent back by the country for seven years longer, with all the force borrowed from popular support. We may readily believe that they would eagerly catch at the chance if it were offered to them. Lord Salisbury, however, denies that any such chance exists. As to the worth of a Government determined to hold out, let the country feel as it may, it is not profitable to dwell very long upon it. We may, nevertheless, make some allowance for those who perceive that their time is short, and who are perplexed as to what the immediate future contains for them. All that they can be expected to do is to make the best of a bad bargain—hanging on to the last moment possible, if only, as the saying has it, by the skin of their teeth. Lord Salisbury's denial is indeed significant.

SOUND WORDS THE Most Rev. Dr. Keane, Rector of the Catholic University of Washington, whose admirable lecture at Harvard we recently placed before our readers, in speaking the other day at Cambridge, Mass., on education, made

a pertinent reply to an argument that is frequently urged. The particular point is that of the desirableness of bringing children of all denominations up in common so that homogeneity may be preserved. "Is the homogeneity of the American people destroyed by the fact that they go to different churches on Sunday? Would our people be more united and harmonious if we attempted a compromise religion in order that we might go to the same church? No; the contrary would be the case. The surest guarantee of a united people is respect for one another's consciences and convictions." The bishop, however, denied that he had any desire to remove the schools from under State control. Nor, he said, did he plead exclusively for the Catholic Church in this matter. He would gladly give his life to obtain for the American people union with the Catholic Church. "But we must take things as they are. We have a divided Christendom, and we must take it as it is. While I am convinced that any form of Protestantism is not as true as the Catholic Church, yet I would, on the other hand, rather have the children of those who are not Catholics reared in any form of Protestantism than in irreligion. Somebody was surprised that I should have exhorted the students of Harvard College, when I addressed them the other night, to spread the Gospel of Jesus Christ, they being of a different faith. I did so because they do more good to mankind than any man who in his pretended broad-mindedness calls himself an agnostic. He is an enemy of Christianity, trying to plunge it into darkness. Any man believing in Christianity is to some degree a benefactor of humanity. Therefore, the plea for Christian education is far wider than the limits of the Catholic Church; it is for the American people's convictions whatever they may be. I say the same for the Methodist, the Baptist, or the Presbyterian as I say for the Catholic. I have no desire to tyrannize over them, but to diffuse the truth as I see it or as they accept it. And I pray that they may have the courage to teach their children Christianity as they understand it, rather than mere secular education without Christianity in it." The most rev. speaker went on to consider the respect due to the secular system in America from its age there. "How old," he said, "is our school system? People would imagine from the way that some persons talk that it is as old as America. Nonsense. You would think that Washington, and Madison, and Jefferson, and Monroe were raised in public schools. No; they were raised in Christian schools, every one of them." And this, we may add for our own part, may be said of the vast majority of men who have attained to greatness anywhere. The secular system, indeed, must labour for many years before, if ever, it attains equality in this regard with Christian schools. Meantime, we see the worth of that argument as to educating children in common. We also see the attitude towards Christianity of the Catholic Church. How different it is from that of the Protestant sects, willing as they are to risk the faith of their children if only that of Catholic children may also be placed in peril. Dr. Keane's words bring the contrast vividly before us.

CURIOUS IS TRUE. MR BLAINE is mobilising the forces of the United States. What for? To give a little more satisfaction, perhaps, to those Irish voters, to direct whose votes aright the British lion must be erected as a target? What, meantime, has become of that proposal for arbitration by means of which all disputes affecting American Governments were to be peacefully settled? It had hardly been favourably considered when a war took place in Central America. Then a revolution broke out in Brazil. Since then there has been fighting at Buenos Ayres—and now again they are hard at it in Chili. The South American nature, however, appears naturally explosive and interference with it, even by arbitration, might prove difficult. Besides, we believe arbitration was only proposed for disputes between different states, and would not extend to domestic affairs. Civil war, nevertheless, is the worst form of war, and it may reasonably be questioned as to whether countries in which it was frequent would be found very amenable with relation to exterior difficulties. To exclude Canada, however, and indeed the British Empire generally from arbitration, notwithstanding that terrible Irish voter with his demand for a tug at the beard or the tail of the lion over the water, would seem a very serious matter. In fact, it would seem something like straining out a gnat and swallowing a camel to arbitrate for the prevention of hostilities between two republics who e names most people can only recall by reference to a manual of geography, and to discard arbitration in a dispute between the greater powers. The Irish voter should remember, besides, that he has no good end to serve now by a war between America and England. There is no question now of setting up an Irish Republic by the aid of such heroes as, for example, Captain Mike McCarthy. At that attempt, even so genuine a patriot as Mr. William O'Brien has had his laugh—and, as we know, *le ridicule tue*. We need, therefore, no longer desire that Columbia should snatch Britannia's trident from her grasp, and we may be content that British iron-clads should keep afloat as long as their nature permits them—and that, by the way, if we may judge by recent events seems to be only until the first opportunity of sinking comes in their