

tract of country from Guelph to Lake Huron.

Of Father Schneider the authoress says:

"He was an important character apart from his constant role of peacemaker. He had a charmed life among the enemies of his religion."

Once between Goderich and Irlishtown he met the Orangemen having a walk. They opened up their ranks to let him pass through, which he did, bowing right and left as in a progress, they saluting as he passed along the aisle made for him. To have had such a position was no small testimony to a man's worth. . . . He was a constant and welcome visitor at houses outside of his own flock."

The book has an introduction by the Rev. Principal Grant of Queen's University, Kingston, and is published by Mr. William Briggs of the Methodist Book Concern, Toronto.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

LAST week's issue of the Buffalo *Catholic Union* and *Times* reflects great credit upon its managers. It contained a historical sketch of the diocese of Buffalo, and beautifully printed portraits of the most distinguished ecclesiastics attending the consecration of the Right Rev. Dr. Quigley, as well as interesting pictures of the prominent Catholic institutions of the diocese. Altogether, it was the finest specimen of newspaper enterprise we have yet seen on the part of the Catholic press of America. Congratulations, Father Cronin!

THE European great powers have at last arrived at an agreement concerning the policy to be observed in regard to Turkey, Greece, and Crete, but it cannot be said that the agreement is honorable to the half a dozen nations which are styled the Great Christian powers. Little Greece has shown itself self capable of mastering the situation, if left alone, but the great powers now assert that Crete must remain part of Turkey, paying a tribute to the Sultan while otherwise enjoying autonomy. They agree that Turkey's sovereignty is to be maintained and Greece compelled to withdraw her troops from the island. Greece has up to the last moment declared that she will not withdraw, as the entire nation is for the annexation of Crete; but there is a report to the effect that King George of Greece has yielded to the demands of the powers. The Liberal party in England are indignant at the attitude of the British Government, especially for having led in the bombardment of the Cretan insurgents' position at Cania.

THE appointment of Bishops of the Syro-Chaldean rite by the Holy Father for the Christians of that rite on the Malabar coast in Southern India has given great satisfaction. An address has been sent by the clergy and laity of Ernakulam, one of the three new dioceses of that rite, to the Pope thanking him for the interest he has taken in their behalf, and for having given them Bishops of their own rite in accordance with petitions which they have many times sent to the Holy See. The general meeting which adopted the address expresses sincere loyalty, true affection and obedience to the Apostolic See. Such touching incidents as this are a grand manifestation of the universality and unity of the Catholic Church amid all the diversities of race and language throughout the world.

The objections raised in the Senate to the arbitration treaty between the United States and Great Britain bring to notice the difficulty of finding any sovereign so free from political bias towards one or other of the nations concerned, as to be an impartial umpire when an international dispute is under consideration. Some Senators as a matter of course are opposed to any peaceful settlement with England, as their political capital consists in "twisting the lion's tail." Their doing so makes them popular with their constituents. But there are more serious difficulties than those arising out of a desire for mere tail-twisting. It is believed by many that the interests of King Oscar of Sweden are on the side of England, and that he would therefore be objectionable as an umpire. There is only one sovereign who is perfectly free from national prejudices, and that is the Pope. It was partly for this reason that in the Middle Ages he was regarded as the general arbitrator between the nations of Christendom, and in the present general desire to have a reliable tribunal of arbitration it is among the possibilities that Protestant and Catholic nations alike may agree on making the Pope the general arbitrator for the settlement of disputes between nations.

THE MANITOBA SCHOOLS.

Rev. Father Marion, of Douglas, Ont., Answers Premier Laurier.

To the Editor of the True Witness:

From the very outset I wish it to be understood that my opposition to the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier does not, in the slightest degree, proceed from personal animosity, for not very long ago I counted myself among the number of his admirers. If I stated in my letter of the 30th ult. aught that appears harsh, it was because the honorable gentleman, before an immense audience, quoted incorrectly, in every instance, from the "Memorandum of Settlement," and thus endeavored to rehabilitate a settlement which is repudiated by the Hierarchy of the Dominion and by every impartial man who understands the nature of its provisions.

The Hon. Premier is evidently not in love with his "settlement"; he never reads it before a public gathering; he does not want to speak of it, and when he does speak of it, he appears to be ashamed of it.

Justice for the oppressed and downtrodden minority of Manitoba bade me to say more; charity forbade me to say less.

The question at issue is acknowledged by all to be of supreme importance.

The imperative duty of the Premier is to explain and not to conceal the nature and the true meaning of the settlement, its scope and consequences.

The reader must recollect, that the honorable gentleman, unsolicited by the minority and the Hierarchy of the Dominion, assumed the roll of champion or vindicator of the acknowledged, though sacrificed educational rights of his compatriots in the Province of Manitoba.

Still, what is the fact? The Honorable Premier accepted the "settlement," notwithstanding its preamble indicates it to be a final one, without presenting it to the minority for consideration, or the Episcopal for examination or approval, and permitted it to be submitted to and receive the endorsement of the electors of the constituency (Brandon) of Dalton McCarthy—the fiercest foe of Catholic educational rights.

Is this not an extraordinary situation? It is, I think, unparalleled in the history of our times.

Few persons in foreign countries can comprehend the situation as it actually exists.

In this country sincere Catholics are so humiliated, amazed and perplexed by the multitudinous and manifold procedures of the Honorable Premier that they are breathlessly awaiting rather than predicting future developments.

The writer's opinion is that the Premier has made out of the sacred rights of the minority a political ball for his own purposes, and, after exploiting it, unconcernedly leaves it to the mercy of the winds.

If I am mistaken in my judgment, and I hope I am, I will humbly apologize and make ample amends. His present attitude, at all events, challenges the electorate, who may at times, but not at all times, be deceived to pronounce, in a constitutional manner, a righteous judgment upon his extraordinary and incomprehensible procedure.

The Honorable Premier, as is well known, took the question out of the hands of Sir Charles Tupper, under the pretext of giving the minority of Manitoba a better settlement of their grievance.

Now, by his lack of diplomacy—using the mildest word at my command—the rights of the minority are in a most perilous position, and by the present "settlement" entirely sacrificed.

The Hon. gentleman appears to be working for the minority and is yet found laboring in behalf of the majority. Surely this is confusion.

The Premier, by his blundering educational question, introduced into the House of Commons a question which has occupied the minds of parliamentary legislators more than any other question since Confederation.

The Conservatives, in July, 1895, blundered by procrastination, and again, during the first part of the session of 1896, by pusillanimity.

But the Honorable Premier, as far as Catholic interests are concerned, blundered during the whole period. And finally he blundered in accepting from the hands of Mr. Greenway a settlement which does not contain the essential features of Separate schools.

This barren settlement brings upon the Premier the opprobrium of Catholics, the scorn of liberal minded Protestants and the ridicule of the enemies of the minority's rights.

Just fancy the answer of an intelligent Protestant to a Catholic who enquired if he liked the School Bill. The prompt answer was, "It is a good Protestant Bill."

If our Premier had the pluck of Sir A. T. Galt, the determination of Protestants generally, we would not be reduced to the humiliating position of begging for crumbs at the feet of Mr. Greenway.

This should not be our position by the history of the question; but we have been brought there by overconfidence in the oft repeated words: "I am a Catholic and a Frenchman."

If a Liberal or a Conservative French member had the courage of a Galt or an English speaking Catholic member the earnestness of a Winthorpe, the question would be saved and the Premier necessitated to remember his promises and to twiddle no longer about his having "settled" the question in six months. Surely

any child could have "settled" the question as he did!

In my last letter I proved that Clause 5, which was inserted in the memorandum, to secure Catholic teachers, is abortive.

The clause, I showed, requires 25 Catholic children of average attendance, etc., and not 25 children, as Mr. Laurier says. I there proved, by the statistics of the 12 mixed schools in the County of Renfrew, having a Catholic teacher, that the proportion between the average and roll or register attendance for these schools was two and two-thirds; and that, therefore, 25 of average attendance means almost 67 children.

I further proved from the same figures that only 9 of an average attendance is necessary to secure a Catholic teacher.

It is well to remember that the Manitoba School Act requires only 10 children to form a school section. This clause 5 is disposed of. It is more barren than the desert Sahara, affording not one single oasis for the enjoyment of Catholic rights.

The Premier might just as well have said: "When you have 300 children attending a school I will permit you to have a Catholic teacher."

I shall now proceed, as indicated in my last letter, to consider the religion clauses.

Bear in mind that by the "settlement" Catholic Separate schools have disappeared from the statutes of Manitoba, and are now substituted by Godless, neutral or secular schools.

I shall even, at the hazard of lengthening this letter beyond the bounds contemplated, reproduce all the religion clauses, that the reader may have every facility of judging their value for himself.

Clause 2. Religious teaching to be conducted as hereinafter provided: (1) If authorized by a resolution passed by a majority of the school trustees, or (2) If a petition be presented to the Board of school trustees asking for religious teaching and signed by the parents or guardians of at least ten children attending the school in the case of a rural district, or by the parents or guardians of at least twenty-five children attending the school in a city, town or village.

Clause 3. Such religious teaching to take place between the hours of 8:30 and 9 o'clock in the afternoon, and to be conducted by any Christian clergyman whose charge includes any portion of the school district, or by any person duly authorized by such clergyman, or by a teacher when so authorized.

Clause 4. Where so specified in such resolution of the Trustees, or where so required by the petition of the parents or guardians, religious teaching during the prescribed period may take place only on specified days of the week instead of on every teaching day.

Clause 5. Where religious teaching is required to be carried on in school in pursuance of the foregoing provisions, and there are Roman Catholic children and non-Roman Catholic children attending such school, and the schoolroom accommodation does not permit of the pupils being placed in separate rooms for the purpose of religious teaching, provisions shall be made by the regulations of the Department of Education which regulations the Board of School Trustees shall observe, whereby the time allotted for religious teaching shall be divided in such a way that the religious teaching of the Roman Catholic children may be carried on during the prescribed period on one-half of the teaching days in each month, and the religious teaching of the non-Roman Catholic children may be carried on during the prescribed period on one-half of the teaching days in each month.

Clause 6. Where the school-room accommodation at the disposal of the trustees permits, instead of allotting different days of the week to the different denominations for the purpose of religious teaching the pupils may be separated when the hour for religious teaching arrives and placed in separate rooms.

I notice lengthy discussions in the Province of Quebec as to whether one half an hour a day is sufficient for religious instruction. I think this is trifling with time, for in Catholic minority schools in Manitoba, of the same number as found in my parish, I could as a priest impart religious instruction in each school during only six half hours for the whole year and at most fifteen half hours for the whole year.

The Hon. Mr. Laurier, in his speech at the Windsor Hotel, Montreal, said: "Now, here is the proposition offered by Mr. Greenway: Wherever there are ten Catholic children it will be permitted to 'priests' to enter the school at half-past 3 o'clock and give religious teaching."

I shall briefly but clearly show to the Hon. Premier how often that I as a "priest," might enter in virtue of his "settlement" my schools for the purpose aforesaid.

The careful reader may observe while considering the religion clauses that two legal ways are provided for the introduction of religion into schools and two equally legal methods for determining the number of days of the week on which the said religious instruction may be imparted.

It is perplexing to notice that the Hon. Premier, by the religion clauses, give non-Catholics new statutory rights to which they are not entitled by the Public School Act of Manitoba, and at the same time ignores and abrogates the rights of their persecuted brethren—rights which they formerly enjoyed and rights which he promised to restore.

But the perplexity vanishes, in Mr. Greenway's case, when one assumes that his object in the settlement is not to give privileges to Catholics—for it was easily to be foreseen that the Catholics of Manitoba would never accept such a settlement—but to give non-Catholics the right of teaching religion in schools which had been recognized even by the Privy Council as non-sectarian. Perhaps, after all, the Protestant's ready answer to the enquiry of his Catholic friend is as truthful as witty.

Let Protestants know that no bigotry tinged the writer's pen. I refer to the anomalous position of the Hon. Premier to show Catholics the degradation to which they are subjected by the "settlement."

Sub sections 1 and 2 of clause 2 prescribe the manner or mode by which religion may be introduced: 1st, By a majority resolution of the Board of Trustees; 2nd, by the petition of the parents or guardians of ten children (not necessarily Catholics) in rural districts, and of 25 in cities, towns and villages.

Observe right here that by these two sub sections Protestants acquire a new statutory right which is not given them by the present Public School law, while Catholics lose their rights acquired by the legislation of 1871.

These two sub-sections of clause 2 may appear at first sight harmless and necessary for the purpose intended, but on reading clause 4 the reader will be astonished to find that such is really not true.

Clause 3 determines the hour for religious instruction and the persons by whom it may be conducted.

Here again the Protestants acquire a new statutory right and the Catholics lose their acquired rights.

Clause 1, which I shall designate as the "insidious" clause, permits sub sections 1 and 2 to limit the number of teaching days for religious instruction at least to two. Let clause 1 be carefully read and it will definitely exhibit the full meaning of sub-sections 1 and 2. For the Board of Trustees, as found in 1, or the petitioners, as found in 2, may, while introducing the teaching of religion in schools, determine or specify, at the same time, the number of days on which religion may be taught.

Now, if the "resolution" or the "petition" did not specify the number of days, religion might be taught on every teaching day, but, if restricted by "resolution" or "petition," then religious teaching would be permitted only on two days of the week.

Since there are five teaching days in the week clause 1, if unlimited by 1 and 2, would give for religious instruction, to Protestants and Catholics combined, 20 days in the month; and, if restricted to two days in the week, 8 days in the month. A clear apprehension of the "insidious" clause 1, is required to understand clause 5.

I will designate clause 5 as the "deceptive" clause. It defines the number of days belonging to Catholics and non-Catholics for imparting religious instruction in mixed schools. The concluding lines of clause 6 are apt to convey the idea that Catholics invariably have 10 days, that is, one-half of the teaching days in a month. As a matter of fact, it gives Catholics just what clause 4 did through sub sections 1 and 2—no more and no less. Thus, if clause 1 restricts the religious teaching days to two a week for Catholics and Protestants combined, clause 6 will permit 8 days a month, or 4 days for Catholics.

That this is the correct construction of clause 6 will be readily seen from its introductory wording: "In pursuance of the foregoing provisions"; and, further on, "whereby the time allotted for religious teaching"; and again, "shall be carried on during the prescribed period." Moreover, this construction is borne out by the fact that otherwise the Government would be by its own act introducing religion in schools—an intention altogether foreign to the general tenor of the "settlement."

Here again the Protestants acquire a new statutory right and Catholics lose their acquired rights.

Clause 9, which is for schools having more than one room, will not except on certain suppositions, grant a greater number of days. This clause, in turn, creates a new statutory right for Protestants and forfeits the acquired rights of Catholics.

I shall presently inform the Hon. Premier the number of half hours I am permitted by his "settlement" to enter the schools of my parish as a "priest" for the purpose of giving religious instruction.

By the most liberal construction of the "settlement" Catholics have a right to 10 half hours during each school month. There are 209 school days during the school year. One half of these are mine and it means 103 half hours. Divide 103 by 7, the number of my schools, and the result is 14.7 half hours. That is, I am entitled to that all the time I might devote, without omitting one day, to teaching religion in each of my schools would be 15 half hours during the year. I shall now figure out the number of half hours at my disposal if the number of days for religious purposes by clause were limited to two in the week. I should in that case be entitled to only one half hour each week, making 41 half-hours during the school year. Divide these 41 half-hours between my seven schools, and the miserable outcome is that I am entitled to give religious instruction in each of my schools for only six half hours during the year.

How supremely ridiculous would the religion clauses appear if the Hon. Premier had gone into details and stated: "Wherever there are seven

mixed schools in a parish the priest may, by my "settlement," enter each of these schools seven and a half hours, at most, and, in certain conditions, three hours, in the whole year." Still this statement would be perfectly true for all mixed rural schools in Manitoba even—mark it well—should there be only one non-Catholic child attending school in each of the school districts.

When the reader considers the laborious duty of the Catholic ministry, the number of sick calls the priest has at all hours to attend, visits to his missions, inclemency of weather, necessary absence, etc., I believe he will feel inclined to reduce the aforesaid number of hours by one half.

The foregoing needs no comment. It brings to our door humiliation and accumulated degradation.

Yet it may be said that the Hon. Premier was mystifying his audience or indulging in hyperbole when speak of the priest alone; for clause 3 enacts that religious instruction may be given not only by the priest and minister in charge of a district but also by any person duly authorized by such clergyman or by a teacher when so authorized.

The priest's assistant, or deputy, in rural districts, is a myth.

Anybody familiar with the requirements of the office of religious instructor will perceive that the mention of the priest's deputy in the Act is for the purpose of effect.

The Catholic teacher is an important factor, and the value of the religion clauses depends on his presence. When he disappears from the school section so also does religious instruction. But since clause 5 does not give Catholics more teachers than they had without the settlement, the religion clauses lose whatever little value they might have possessed. Moreover, by the settlement, Catholic school sections having but one Protestant pupil may claim the services of a Catholic teacher for only half the teaching hours.

In my next letter I may show the difference that exists between the Smith-Dickey-Desjardins propositions and the so-called Act of Settlement. The comparison of one with the other will be the comparison of a lordly oak with a withered briar bush.

H. S. Marion, P. P., Douglas, Ont.

EVERYDAY QUESTIONS.

Father Elliot Answers Inquiries on Religious Subjects that Arise Almost Daily.

Rev. Walter Elliot, the eloquent Parollet, is conducting a series of lectures or rather missions to non-Catholics in New York City, which are being attended by large numbers. Here are some of the questions that have been put to him and his answers thereto:

CATHOLICS AND FREEMASONS.

"Why are Catholics now allowed to become Freemasons?"

Because in Freemasonry there are things which are morally wrong, and, consequently, the Catholic Church is opposed to the system. First, there was the oath which had the death penalty attached to it, so that a person who violated it subjected himself to death, to have his body cut in four quarters and thrown into the sea at low tide. Again, Masonry was a sort of religion; they had their particular forms of worship, their creed and their code of morality. In Europe, South America and one or two other countries Masons were opposed not only to the Catholic religion, but to all Christianity.

PROTESTANT SPONSORS IN BAPTISM.

"Can a Protestant man be sponsor in the Catholic Church?"

No; it is not permitted.

MARRIAGE IN PROTESTANT CHURCHES.

"Can a Catholic girl get married in a Protestant church?"

Yes, she can; but she ought not to do it. It is a grievous sin against her conscience. She should seek celebration of the sacrament in her own Church.

THE LESSER OF TWO EVILS.

"Is it ever necessary to be between two evils? If so, is it a sin to choose the smaller one if we must choose one or the other?"

It sometimes happens that we have to choose the lesser of two evils, but in this case we do not choose; we are forced along the way in which the least harm is done. For instance, a man who is defending his child from a burglar has got either to see his child killed by the burglar or to kill the burglar in self-defense. He chooses the latter, being the lesser of the two evils.

WHERE CAIN GOT HIS WIFE.

"Adam and Eve had two sons, Cain and Abel. Cain killed Abel; where did he get his wife, and where did Cain's descendants come from?"

Cain did not go into the land of Nod, as many suppose, to get a wife there. Neither were Cain and Abel the only sons of Adam and Eve. There was Seth for instance, and no one knows how many more. However, after the lapse of years, Cain must have married one of his nieces, or, perhaps, one of his sisters, from the necessity of the case.

PROTESTANTS GO "STRAIGHT" TO HEAVEN.

"If Protestants are taken straight to heaven, where do Catholics go to, and why should they go to purgatory?"

Father Elliot said he hoped the questioner did not suppose that purgatory was the exclusive place of Catholics. Catholics and Protestants go to purgatory, if they die in venial sin, and until they have been fully prepared for the kingdom of heaven.

WHY CATHOLICS GENUFLECT.

"Why do Catholics genuflect before the altar?"

There is nothing like courage in misfortune. Next to faith in God and in his overruling Providence, a man's faith in himself is his salvation. It is the secret of all patience and success. It makes a man strong as the pillars of iron; or elastic as the springing steel.

Suffer with Christ, and for Christ, if thou desirest to reign with Christ. (2 Tim. ii. 12.)

Bad habits are thistles in the heart.

going into their places in church?"

Because they believe the Blessed Redeemer is present, and they therefore bow the knee to Him. They know He is present when they see the light burning before the altar.

THE JEW AND SALVATION.

"Will the Jew have any hope of heaven?"

He will, if he is honest, and if he thinks he is right. God will take that into account. If he thinks he is wrong he is bound to examine and find out where to get right.

PROTESTANT CHANCES.

"Will the Protestant who has a chance of salvation, and who willingly rejects it, and who has a chance of learning the truth, and does not embrace it, get to heaven?"

"I do not judge any man," said Father Elliot, "but sins against the Holy Spirit are very serious ones."

Story by Archbishop Ryan.

Archbishop Ryan says that at the banquet of the Press Association in Philadelphia a Catholic gentleman asked him for a dispensation for that occasion only from the pledge which he had recently taken, giving as an excuse that he had many friends there from every part of the United States whom he had not met for years, and who would, as he put it, look upon him as a reformed toper if he did not drink. The Archbishop's answer to the request was: "I won't, but come sit beside me and they can't think you are a reformed toper unless they think I am. And," continued His Grace, "we drank excellent cold water."

WEDDING BELLS.

O'NEIL AGNEW.

St. Michael's church, Douglas, was, on Monday morning, Feb. 22, the scene of a very happy and pleasing marriage, rendered particularly interesting by the high esteem in which the two contracting parties are held. The bride was Miss Lizzie A. Agnew, eldest daughter of Mr. James Agnew, of Bromley; and the groom, Mr. William L. O'Neil, one of the best known and most highly respected young men of Bromley. The bride, arrayed in a handsome suit of pearl grey, with silk and beaded trimmings, looked the perfection of taste and elegance. A very pretty toque, with gloves to match, completed the costume. She was assisted through the nuptial ceremony by her sister, Miss Tessie M. Agnew, who performed her part gracefully and looked pleasing in a handsome suit of brocade with hat and gloves to match. Mr. Jeremiah O'Neil did the honors for the groom in his usual easy, gentlemanly manner.

The bridal party arrived at the church at 8 o'clock, and as they proceeded up the aisle (the bride leaning on the arm of her father), the organ, under the skilful fingers of Miss A. Yonier, pealed forth harmonious strains well selected for the occasion. The nuptial Mass was celebrated by Rev. H. S. Marion, during which the choir rendered choice musical selections. The pastoral benedictions being given, the bridal party, accompanied by the friends of the bride and groom, repaired to the bride's home, where a sumptuous repast awaited them, and where nothing that good will and generous hospitality could furnish was left undone to entertain the guests. After spending a very pleasant afternoon the newly-wedded couple, with their immediate friends, enjoyed a drive to the future home of the bride in Pinevalley, where a most hearty welcome awaited them.

The bride was the recipient of many handsome and useful presents, which she testified the great respect in which she was held. Her many friends congratulated Mr. O'Neil on winning such an amiable bride, and join in wishing both a long and happy journey through life.

Correspondent.

KENNY-FAGAN.

A very pretty event occurred in St. Columba's Church, Irlishtown, on Wednesday morning of last week, being the nuptials of Mr. P. Kenny, of Milton, North Dakota, and Miss Annie Fagan, daughter of Mrs. C. Dale, Seattle.

The interesting ceremony was performed by the Rev. Dean Murphy, after which an adjournment was made to the residence of the bride's aunt, Miss B. O'Neil, where an elegant repast was partaken of by a few of their most intimate friends. The happy couple left on the afternoon train for their future home in the States, followed by the best wishes of a large circle of friends and acquaintances.

"SEPARATE SCHOOLS IN UPPER CANADA."

Dr. Hodgins—who was Chief of the Staff in the Education Department from the time of the Rev. Dr. Ryerson's appointment, as head of the Department, in 1881, until his retirement, in 1895, and until the end of 1896—has in the press of William Briggs a work of the "Legislation and History of Separate Schools in Upper Canada," from their inception, in 1820, to the passage of the "Finality Act" of 1896. On this latter measure were based the provisions of the British North America Act relating to Separate schools. In this connection will be given the text of the local opinions of three noted Queen's Counsel on these provisions, which was published in March 1887. The work will extend to between 100 and 200 pages of printed matter. It will contain a sketch or narrative of the principal proceedings, incidents, and more important correspondence and conferences which took place in the subject of Separate schools from 1824 to 1893, and such later proceedings in regard to the subject as have been of interest.

The text, or a summary thereof, of the various Separate school Bills, amendments, etc., prepared by promoters of Separate schools, members of the Legislature, or others, during those years will be given; also the principal division lists, with names of the members voting, etc. In this work will be given the particulars of the immediate causes which led to the introduction of the principle of Separate schools into the legislation of 1841—the early opinions of Representatives of the Roman Catholic Church and others upon the school system of Upper Canada; tributes to Bishop Power and Charbonnet—extracts from correspondence on the subject—Bishop Macdonell's educational efforts, and other matters; also, opinions on the Separate School Question by public men—Sir John Macdonald, Rev. Dr. Ryerson, and Senator Fenwick (writing a Lower Canada view of the question); William Lyon Mackenzie, J. P. Macdonald, John Elmsley, George Brown, John G. Hawes, J. W. Gamble, and several other public men; and Dr. Ryerson's Confidential Report to the Governor General on Separate schools in 1893.

personal and parliamentary incidents of the struggles on the Separate school question in 1850, 1855 and 1860—attitude of the members of the Legislature on both sides and methods employed in moulding the Separate school legislation of these years, etc. The number and variety of these personal references to prominent individuals will give an especial interest to this work. Altogether, this book will prove to be a most valuable *read*, source of wholly authentic and reliable information on the interesting subject of which it treats. The name of the author is a sufficient guarantee for both the fulness and correctness, as well as accuracy, of the information given.

There is nothing like courage in misfortune. Next to faith in God and in his overruling Providence, a man's faith in himself is his salvation. It is the secret of all patience and success. It makes a man strong as the pillars of iron; or elastic as the springing steel.

Suffer with Christ, and for Christ, if thou desirest to reign with Christ. (2 Tim. ii. 12.)

Bad habits are thistles in the heart.