

The Catholic Record.

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

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Editor.

REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY, THOMAS COFFEY, Publishers and Proprietors.

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

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Persons writing in error should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

the parents' right and duty in indivisible relation to one another. Every God-given right and every legitimate human right entails a corresponding duty, which determines it to its proper purpose, and guarantees it against abuse, whether by caprice, by selfishness or by criminal betrayal on the part of the individual or corporation on whom it has been bestowed. The right vested in the human parent to direct the education of his offspring is a divine trust from Him "of whom is all paternity in heaven and on earth," ordained directly and immediately to the preparation of the young for the secure attainment of their destiny in their passage through the temporal state of trial and danger to the glorious beatitude of the sons of God in His everlasting kingdom. The unnatural or un-Christian parent who, for the sake of advancing his own pecuniary or political interests, betrays this most sacred trust by denying to his child the course of early education which, without additional expense to him, provides the safest and soundest and best assured training of mind and heart for the battle of life, combining all requisite secular knowledge with the higher knowledge and the better discipline of faith and piety leading to God, is guilty of crime in the sight of the Lord and Father of all, for which he shall have to answer at the tribunal of unerring justice. He inflicts irreparable injury on his innocent offspring, the penalty of which is not always deferred to the next life, but is oftentimes exacted from him by divine vengeance in the family home, converting the promise of a peaceful old age into bitterness and anguish and idle remorse. The loss of the child's soul shall be moreover chargeable to him, if, through the want of Christian formation of mind and character, the neglected youth be overcome by the allurements of the world, the flesh and the devil, and led into the ways of impiety and final perdition. Hence the Archbishop of Kingston emphatically binds together parental duty and parental right in the unity of one principle founded in nature and confirmed by the law of grace. The Sacramental grace of Christian marriage is specially provided by our Divine Lord to insure the fulfillment of the parental duty of Christian education of the children. As the Catechism says: "Matrimony is a sacrament that gives grace to married persons to live happily together and bring up their children in the fear and love of God." The marriage vow, is forsworn, the sacramental seal of Christian parentage is dishonored by the betrayal of the parent's duty to rear his offspring in the fear and love of God. Let us now examine the truth of the *Empire's* statement that "these are exactly the principles Mr. Meredith is contending for."

COMPARE THE TWO DECLARATIONS OF PRINCIPLE. The Archbishop of Kingston says: "The Catholic parent has as much right as you, Sir, to educate his child for this life and for the next in the light and warmth of religion according to his faith." No right is here recognized in the parent to give his child a merely secular education. The parental right is determined and controlled by the duty of rearing the child "for this life and for the next," and consequently "in the light and warmth of religion." His Grace proceeds: "The Catholic parent does this, despite the artifices of political agitators ever urging him to betray his own conscience and his child's temporal and eternal interests by the divorce of religion from youthful education." Not only is no right here recognized in the parent to divorce religion from youthful education, but the attempt to exercise such a right, regardless of the law of the parental duty to educate the child in the light and warmth of religion, is set down as a most grievous crime, a betrayal of the parent's own conscience and of his child's temporal and eternal interests." Treating of the right thus indissolubly connected with its directive and restrictive law of duty, the Archbishop affirms, "This parental right is inalienable: no parent can surrender it to you."

Now hear the *Empire's* apologetic and self-consoling argument upon the foregoing: "These are exactly the principles Mr. Meredith is contending for. He recognizes this God-given, inalienable right of the parent to look after the education of his child and respects it, and in so far as the State can prevent it, no man, be he ecclesiastical or layman, shall be permitted to come between the parent and his child, or take control of the education of the latter out of his hands, but that whatever course he takes must be his own voluntary act."

We do not undertake to decide whether the editor of the *Empire* has been deluding himself or audaciously striving to delude the public by his deliberate misinterpretation of the principles at issue between Mr. Meredith and the Archbishop of Kingston. Could he possibly persuade himself, or expect to persuade any but the most unintelligent of his readers, that Mr. Meredith has been all along contend-

ing for the principle of parental rights in the sense declared by the Archbishop, as indissolubly connected with the directive law of duty to educate the young "in the light and warmth of religion according to their faith," under pain of the parent's betrayal of his own conscience and of the temporal and eternal interests of his child? Has not the scope of Mr. Meredith's London speech and of his subsequent controversy with the Archbishop been the maintenance of the principle of secular as opposed to Catholic education? The distinctive character of the Separate schools, and their whole reason for existence, is the union of religious with secular education. Did not Mr. Meredith repeatedly express regret that these schools are recognized and secured by the Constitution under which we live? Did he not loudly condemn the system in its principle, and express a hope that the Legislature may some day be empowered to abolish it? Did he not inveigh fiercely against the Government for having allowed these schools to increase in number? and did he not affirm in London that the ministry who would encourage their development should be held guilty of treason against the State? Did he not propose various ugly and unworthy contrivances for gradually undermining them and weakening their efficiency to such a degree that the Catholic laity might, it was hoped, finally become disgusted with them and thus morally constrained to acquiesce in their abolition? Have not the journals that advocate Mr. Meredith's cause clamoured, still more loudly than he might dare, against the Separate schools, their principle and their continued existence? With what face, then, does the *Empire* say that the principles set forth by the Archbishop of Kingston are the self same that Mr. Meredith is contending for? The *Empire's* own exposition of the principle which he declares to be common to the Archbishop and Mr. Meredith bears witness against him, since he has felt bound to willfully misstate it in order to make believe that Mr. Meredith agrees with His Grace. He represents it in the paragraph just quoted as a principle of right uncontrolled and undirected by any law of duty, or any rule of conscientious action, but left solely to the parent's arbitrary will and whim; and he, furthermore, insists on behalf of Mr. Meredith that there is no authority in "ecclesiastical or layman" to regulate the arbitrary will of the irresponsible parent or correct his erroneous conscience. Is not this exactly the reverse of the Archbishop's clearly defined principle? Is it not repugnant to all civil as well as moral law? Has any crack-brained theorist ever before said the like? Every right conferred by the State or recognized by it is circumscribed and checked by a law of duty in regard of its exercise. The right to carry arms, to vote at elections, to keep a saloon, to control a railway or steamboat, and all whatsoever civil rights, are subject to proper laws guarding against abuse in their exercise. "A man's house is his castle," but if he ill uses his wife or chastises his boy to a degree of cruelty within his castle the officers of the law will forcibly enter, and he shall be punished by the courts for having unduly enforced his rights. All high functionaries, whether of Church or State, are similarly controlled by the law of duty in the use of their undoubted rights; and even Her Majesty the Queen is not free under the British Constitution to employ her sovereign rights and prerogatives arbitrarily, but only in accordance with the provisions of the great charter. By what mysterious, and hitherto unrevealed, code of ethics does the *Empire* or Mr. Meredith exempt the parent's right, in regard of the religious or non-religious education of his child, from subjection to the law of duty directing its legitimate exercise and guaranteeing the child, the family, the social circle and the State against its misdirection or willful abuse?

MORE INTOLERANT RHODOMONTADE. During the election campaign in Ottawa, Mr. Dalton McCarthy made one of his now frequent appeals to bigotry in favor of Mr. Hay, the no Popery candidate for the Commons. He again threatened the country with civil war unless the platform of the Equal Rights party be adopted. This is talk of the same style in which he spoke to the Orangemen on the last twelfth of July at St. Aymer, but we have had too much experience of the sort of courage which possesses the Orangemen of Ontario to care for Mr. McCarthy's blood and thunderspeeches. They are brave when attacking defenceless women and children, and wrecking their houses, but a civil war, where they would meet man hand to hand, is not one of the possibilities they contemplate. The Catholics of Ontario and Quebec are not to be terrorized by Mr. McCarthy's threats. They are peaceable and law-abiding citizens, but they are willing to bear their share of the burden of preserving order, and they despise the Orange rhodomontade as much at the present time as they have ever done in the past.

It is not true that we look for, or expect, any special privileges for the Catholic Church or people. We desire nothing of the kind, and further, we are fully aware that if such special privileges were granted to Catholics they would be a constant bone of contention in the country. But such special privileges do not exist. Catholics have not in Ontario even the representation that our ratio of population would justly demand, nor have we anything approaching to a fair proportion of public offices.

We have, it is true, the Separate school system of Ontario, but this constitutes no special privilege. On the contrary, it is the merest recognition of the natural right of parents to educate their children in accordance with their conscientious convictions. It is a right equally conferred upon the Protestants of Quebec, and of Ontario also. We have no desire to deprive Protestants of this right in either Province; but if in any Catholic locality the Protestants of Ontario do not wish to exercise their right to establish Separate schools, that is no reason why the Catholics of the Province should have their rights curtailed.

THE IMPREGNABLE ROCK. Such is the title of an able article written by Mr. W. E. Gladstone in proof of the divine inspiration of Holy Scripture. The article is found in the April number of a periodical styled *Good Words*. Mr. Gladstone deals in theology occasionally, as well as in political economy and home rule for Ireland. It must be admitted that Mr. Gladstone, although most eloquent—probably the most pleasing and most fervent living orator—has not been a success as a polemical athlete. He was very badly worsted in his controversy with Cardinal Manning on the question of Papal Infallibility. The learned and venerable Archbishop of Westminster said at that time that, by attempting to disprove or discredit the dogma of infallibility, Mr. Gladstone had hurt himself very grievously and "had tarnished a great name." The Grand Old Man had also condescended to argue with the much despised agnostic, Robert Ingersoll, and by doing so rather lowered himself in the estimation of the literary world. He now comes to the rescue of the Protestant bible, to save it from the attacks of the irreligious scoffers at all things sacred. His work must be a Herculean one, and we do not think him quite able to handle so difficult a subject or master the details of a problem so complex and so mysterious in the eyes of an incredulous age and of a sceptical generation of men and women such as swear by the material progress of this nineteenth century. Indeed Mr. Gladstone abandons the idea of taking up the Holy Scripture piecemeal and exercising his powers of discrimination on mere facts or truths half hidden or concealed. He deals rather in generalities, and invokes the aid of syncretism rather than the more satisfying analysis. He asks his readers, as the *Northern Advance*, of Manchester (Eng.), says, to look broadly and largely at the subject of Holy Scriptures; not as philosophers or theologians, but as men of sense and discrimination, who should not allow themselves to be led away from broad and large contemplation into discussions which, though in their own place legitimate, may needful, yet are secondary, and therefore when substituted for primary, are worse than frivolous. The impression prevails, says Mr. Gladstone, that in England and other countries the operative classes have, at the great centres of population, largely lost their hold upon the Christian creed, and this means, he declares, that their sense of the dignity and value of the sacred record is blunted and effaced.

It comes to this with the Protestant world that, not only among its operative classes, but among its millionaire princes and scientific circles, the Holy Scriptures are criticized, found wanting and held up to contempt. Even the most learned of its rev. divines, by revising the sacred text, by expunging whole sentences in one chapter and changing the letter and sense of words and paragraphs in another, and thus giving to the world a new bible, prove conclusively that the whole unadulterated truth revealed by God to man was not contained in the old bible. And yet it is the old edition that men were educated to regard as containing the entire word of God in its purity and holiness. The bible, with all its imperfections, was their rule of faith. To read the bible, whether revised or not; to commit sentences of it to memory, whether properly translated or not; to form one's opinion upon its teachings; and found churches and congregations upon the strength of some isolated passage improperly rendered—this, in the Protestant world, was considered truer religion. The divine teacher, commissioned by God to explain its mysteries, was set aside and railed against and held up as anti-Christ. Catholics now may look on with perfect unconcern at the jarring multitudes of the heretical world, some contending for the sacredness of the text in the old edition, many more holding out for the new, and all maintaining their right to private interpretation; while the more learned, as

the most illiterate (the operative classes), have "lost their hold upon the Christian creed, and their sense of the value and dignity of the sacred record is blunted and effaced."

All Catholics believe in the Holy Scripture as the Divine Word, which, if properly translated and explained by a teacher commissioned of God, must lead unto all truth and holiness. But this explanation is found in the unwritten word of God as handed down from the apostles and their immediate successors, the martyrs who sealed their testimony in blood, and the early fathers who wrote and taught by word of mouth in the days of the Church's pristine purity and glory. But there is for Catholics no necessity why Mr. Gladstone, or any other eloquent polemicist, should try to convince us of the divinity of Holy Scripture. We have it on the authority of the Catholic Church that the holy bible is the inspired word of God as revealed to the sacred writers—Moses, the Prophets and the Evangelists. We bow down to her dogmatic decisions and, knowing that it is her's to teach and ours to be taught, we rest satisfied and at peace, while the multitudes around are contending and at war about every unexplained incident and every (for them) obscure and doubtful text.

The *Northern Advance*, Manchester, after quoting at length from Mr. Gladstone's essay, winds up with a flourish and in triumph as follows: "In the succeeding articles Mr. Gladstone intends to show that in his view science and research have done much to sustain the historical credit of the Old Testament, and have thus added strength to the belief that we have in it a divine revelation." It is about time the Protestant world should be convinced at once and forever that they have in Holy Scripture a divine revelation. The *Christian Guardian* quotes in last week's number the entire article of the *Manchester Advance*, and takes the same pleasure in announcing to its readers that Mr. Gladstone's essay will have the effect of building up the Protestant faith by insuring a more general belief in the inspiration of the bible. A general disbelief in the bible would insure the downfall of Protestantism, seeing that it will not acknowledge either a teaching church or an infallible head to guide unto all truth.

PROGRESSING INTO DEISM. The natural result of the first principle of Protestantism, which is the supremacy of private judgment over all living authority, has often been pointed out. If there be no living authority in the Church of God, entitled to teach in Christ's name, the door will be evidently opened to all errors in faith. It is useless to make a distinction between essential and non essential, between fundamental and unimportant articles of faith, as the custom is nowadays. There is no such distinction made in Scripture, nor is it founded upon any practice or tradition of the Church of Christ in all ages. On the contrary, the Spirit of Truth whom Christ sent to instruct His Apostles, was to teach them all truth, and the commission given by Christ to His Apostles was to teach all things revealed by Him. All the truths of religion are, therefore, essentials. Each individual may not know all the truths of religion, but the Church of Christ must hold and teach them. It is in the nature of error to extend itself as time lapses, unless there be a criterion or guide by means of which truth may be known to a certainty. Religious truth is not ascertained by reasoning, but by revelation. If, therefore, there be only the individual reason whereby to judge religious truth, once it has been revealed, we must by degrees wander away therefrom gradually, till little or nothing be left of the original revelation. This is, in fact, what occurs in the various forms of Protestantism, and it is scarcely matter for surprise that the first fruit of the revision movement of Presbyterianism has been a decided victory for rationalism and infidelity. A faith which can be revised is, of course, human, and it is quite within the province of men to revise it until nothing distinctive of Christianity be left; and this is what has occurred as the first result of the Presbyterian Revision movement in England. The synod of the English Presbyterian Church is further on the road to a revised creed than the American Church. A committee was appointed by the last synod to frame new articles which were to be subjected to the synod at its next meeting, and the committee has completed its work. The committee proposes, instead of the very decisive declaration of the Westminster Confession, that the Scripture is the Word of God, to substitute the following equivocal article "on Holy Scripture:" "We believe that God, who manifests Himself in creation and providence, and especially in the spirit of man, has been pleased to reveal His mind and will for our salvation at successive periods and in various ways; and that this Revelation has been, so far as needful, committed to writing by men inspired of the Holy Spirit, in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, which are, therefore, to be devoutly studied by all as God's written Word or message to man."

kind; and we reverently acknowledge the Holy Spirit speaking in the Scriptures to be the Supreme Judge in questions of faith and duty."

It is perfectly well understood that this is the result of a compromise between those who call themselves the "orthodox" and the "more advanced" parties in the Church, and, as the proposed article of belief may mean just whatever we wish, it will be impossible under it to impeach as heretics those who deny the truth of any part of the bible, as Bishop Colenso, of the Anglican Church, did before. Even he acknowledged that the bible contains the Word of God, in the same sense as the Hindu Vedas—or possibly the Book of Mormon.

Of course we cannot foretell whether the synod will adopt the new articles as agreed upon by the committee, but it is highly probable that the committee fairly represents the views of the synod. The members were not blindly appointed; for, with the discussions now going on with regard to this very point, we must suppose that the synod knew that this subject would be considered. Whatever course, however, the synod may follow it must be evident to all that Presbyterianism is to-day on the very verge of emerging itself into Deism. Athelism will be only a question of time, unless its professors return to the unity of Catholic faith.

DEATH OF FATHER JOHN O'CONNOR. Among the many sad deaths of priests and bishops it has been our duty to chronicle within the last few years, none was attended with such an utter sense of bereavement or left so many weeping hearts as the death of Rev. Father John O'Connor, P. P., Maidstone, which occurred on last Sunday. Father O'Connor was born near Whitby, in the township of Pickering, of pious Catholic parents. From boyhood his instincts and aspirations led him to a life of piety and self sacrifice. He was educated at St. Michael's College and finished his course of theology in the Grand Seminary of St. Sulpice at Montreal. He was among the first priests ordained to the sacred ministry by the Right Rev. Dr. Walsh, Bishop of this diocese. His first pastoral charge commenced in Blyth and St. Augustine, township of Wawanosh, where he endeavored himself to all by his modest demeanor, his unostentatious piety and his indefatigable zeal. His labors were crowned with success in the liquidation of debts and the erection of a beautiful pastoral residence, which was left built and furnished without one cent of debt, at his removal to Maidstone in 1884. In this latter parish he found a debt of \$8,000, which has been entirely extinguished. A new brick church was lately erected in Essex Centre and shall long stand a monument to his zeal and piety.

Rev. Father O'Connor has been ailing for some weeks. A severe attack of influenza was too much for his constitution, enfeebled by the labors of a hard missionary life. Surrounded by his nearest clerical friends, among whom was his near relative, Very Rev. Dr. O'Connor, President of Assumption College, and fortified with the rites and sacraments of holy Church, he breathed his last sigh on the evening of Saturday, the 3rd inst. His funeral, attended by the entire parish and by most of the priests of this diocese, took place on Tuesday. Many and fervent shall be the prayers offered up for perpetual light and eternal rest to his soul.

A SENSATIONAL STORY. The Toronto *Mail's* Ottawa correspondent asserts that in a recent interview between Sir John Macdonald, Messrs. Wm. Meredith, Creighton, Clancy and other members of the Ontario opposition, it is reported to have been resolved, in obedience to a request from Sir John, that Mr. Meredith should issue a manifesto on behalf of his party, wherein he should retreat from his unwise position of hostility to Catholics and Catholic schools. The *Mail* thinks it very probable that the report is true; but while it admits the probability that the course which has hitherto been followed by the opposition will result in their defeat, it advises Mr. Meredith to persevere in this course.

The *Mail's* advice being acted upon by the Conservative party in 1886 resulted in the total defeat of that party at the polls, and we believe with the *Mail* that the same result will follow at the election which is imminent. We do not credit the *Mail's* sensational report from Ottawa, for such tactics would be unprecedented on the eve of a general election, though we can readily imagine that Sir John Macdonald has advised a more moderate and conciliatory course than has been followed so far by Mr. Meredith and his lieutenants. If Mr. Meredith's Opera House speech had been the result of a sudden ebullition of ill-temper, it would indeed prove him unfit for the leadership of a great party, yet it might more easily be overlooked. But it was the deliberate declaration of the issue upon which the coming contest should be fought out,