

Northwest Review

"AD MAJOREM DEI GLORIAM."

THE ONLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTEREST OF ENGLISH SPEAKING CATHOLICS WEST OF TORONTO.

VOL. 10, NO. 38.

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 3, 1895.

\$ 2.00 per Year (Single Copies 2 cents)

FATHER CHERRIER'S REPLY TO MR. TURK.

The Methodist Minister's Statements Considered and Fully Discussed.

His Conceptions of Justice and Charity Criticized. His Statistics Proved to be Faulty. Authorities Quoted to Shew That His "Arguments" Were Based On False Premises.

The Church of the Immaculate Conception was crowded to its utmost capacity on Sunday last with a congregation made up of leading citizens of all denominations and of many nationalities, attracted by the announcement that the Pastor, Rev. Father Cherrier, would speak on the school question, and that his discourse would be the answer of the Catholics of Manitoba to the sermon delivered by the Rev. M. Turk at Grace Methodist Church the previous Sunday. We take much pleasure in giving below a full report of Father Cherrier's remarks, and we can with confidence assert that every unbiased reader can come to but one conclusion, viz: That considered as an answer to the Methodist Divine it was complete.

Father Cherrier spoke from the text "Fear God, Honor the King," 1st Peter, xi chapter, 17 verse: "Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them. Mat. vii, verse 12. He said: "These words were last Sunday chosen by a reverend Methodist preacher of our city as a fitting text, it appears, to a long and elaborate sermon on the school question, that burning school question which just now and so rightly occupies the public attention. In the mind of the reverend gentleman "these words of Scripture are so plain, they require no explanation but only to be applied. They set forth our duty to God, and earthly rulers, and lay before us the Christian standard of conduct between man and man. For this reason," added Mr. Turk, "I have chosen them as a motto, I desire to keep before me while I speak to guide and control both thought and utterance." My intention to-day is to speak to you also on the school question, and although I feel that I cannot do better than follow the reverend pastor of Grace church in the choice of a text befitting the circumstance, I must confess I am at the outset quite confident I shall arrive at conclusions very different from his. Taking, however, what he calls "a motto," for my guidance I will promise him that whilst feeling in duty bound to criticize his utterances I shall do so without forgetting to do unto me. "Fear God, Honor the King," that is fear the Lord for "there is no power but from God." Rom. xiii, v. 1: "Honor the King" for he that resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God, and that resist purchase to themselves damnation." Ibidem xiii, v. 2. So much in a nutshell for the respect and humble submission which we all owe to those constituted in authority. But let us see how the precept is put into practice by our separated brethren of the Methodist church in Winnipeg. I say in Winnipeg because the whole Methodist church in Canada does not appear to be of the same mind on this question. In Montreal, for instance, the resolution, "Resolved that the Roman Catholics of Manitoba have a right to a separate school system," having been discussed in the parlors of St. James' Methodist church on Saturday evening, the 23rd inst., and the question submitted to the audience decision was given in favor of the affirmative. But it was not so here, however, for Mr. Turk informs us that at a meeting of the Methodist Ministerial association of Winnipeg a resolution was passed and wired to Ottawa protesting against interference with the school system of Manitoba, "first, because by this law no injustice is done to any citizen; second, such interference would infringe upon provincial rights which are sacred." Let us pause here a moment to consider how far the conviction of duty as embodied in the resolution is consistent with the fear of the Lord and the honor due to the King. It is all very well for any section of the community to advocate for themselves a system of so-called national schools, a fair definition of which is yet to be found, a system of schools that will meet the wants of such as compose that section of the community, but, it is another thing to impose it upon others, a minority whose conscience cannot admit of it, and whose right it is to refuse to submit to such a system. Had Mr. Turk for whom personally I entertain a high esteem, had he and the members of the Ministerial association prefixed to their grand resolution some of the clauses of both the British North America act and the Manitoba act, it might by the contrast have caused them to somewhat alter the wording of their resolution, and perhaps even the substance of it." Father Cherrier then read sub-section 3 of section 93 of the British North America act, 1870, and continued, "In the face of these important clauses which it is as clear as daylight are intended for the protection of minorities, whether Protestant or Catholic, it is hard to understand how Mr. Turk and his co-members of the Methodist Ministerial association could have been brought to the conclusions embodied in their resolution, and entertain at the same time a true fear of God and proper honor of the king. They say that "by

this law (the school act of 1890) no injustice is done to any citizen," and Mr. Turk adds that our grievance is only a technical one. When in the case of Barrett vs. the city of Winnipeg, their lordships of the privy council declared the law of 1890 *intra vires*, although "it was not doubted (in the estimation of their lordships) that the object of the 1st sub-section of section 22 of the Manitoba act was to afford protection to denominational schools;" although: to this day there is neither man or woman who gives any attention to such matters, who will not admit that in the minds of those who framed the Manitoba act that sub-section was meant to establish for all time to come a system of public denominational schools in Manitoba, however, because their lordships had to consider, according to their own words, "not what may be supposed to have been intended, but what has been said," (see Manitoba School Case, page 273); their lordships pronounced a judgment altogether adverse to the interests of the Catholic minority. Did then the pastor of Grace church and his fellow Protestant clergymen find any fault with the technical difficulties of the law. No, far from it, for I would not be surprised to hear that he was of the number who exhorted the poor Catholics of Manitoba to humbly submit. We had no need, however, of such exhortation, for the Catholics are

LAW-ABIDING CITIZENS, and though the law might accidentally enforce an outrageous injustice upon them, the Catholics accepted the consequence with no other resistance than the recourse which law itself granted them for constitutional redress. Now the position is somewhat altered by the last judgment of the privy council and so it comes to pass that Mr. Turk will find fault with the law and call our grievance only a technical one; nay, the reverend gentleman, in accord with the members of his ministerial association, will have it that "by the school act of 1890 no injustice is done to any citizen." I am sorry that a minister of the Gospel should so forget his own teaching as taken from the Bible: "Fear God, honor the King." "No injustice is done to any citizen," he says, and yet what has the supreme tribunal of the realm pronounced on this very question; what have the representatives of Her Gracious Majesty "Honor the King"—decreed regarding this very point. Has the pastor of Grace church forgotten to read the passage of their lordships judgment regarding the grievance of the Catholic minority? Let and the information of such as are displeased to allow themselves to be blinded by prejudice and religious bigotry. "The sole question," said the Lord Chancellor, "to be determined is whether a right or privilege which the Roman Catholic minority previously enjoyed has been affected by the legislation of 1890. Their Lordships are unable to see how this question can receive any but an affirmative answer. Contrast the position of the Roman Catholic prior and subsequent to the acts from which they appeal. Before these national schools, of which the control and management were in the hands of Roman Catholics who could select the character of religious teaching. These schools received their proportionate share of the money contributed for school purposes out of the general taxation of the province, and the money raised for these purposes by local assessments was, so far as it fell upon Catholics, applied only towards the support of Catholic schools. What is the position of Roman Catholics under the act of 1890. Schools according to their views will receive no aid from the state. They must depend entirely for their support upon the contributions of the Roman Catholic community, while the taxes out of which state aid is granted to the schools provided for by the statute fall alike on Catholic and Protestant. Moreover, while the Catholic inhabitants remain liable to local assessment for school purposes, the proceeds of that assessment are no longer destined to any extent for the support of Catholic schools, but are applied to the education of Catholic children in their own character." Such being the anyone to deny the facts related in their Lordships' judgment, how could an unbiased mind honestly entertain the idea that by the school act of 1890 no injustice is done to any citizen. Mr. Dallon McCarthy, himself, at the hearing of the appeal case in Ottawa could not but acknowledge that we have a grievance, and not merely a technical one, for in answer to the Hon. Mr. Curran's remark "there is a grievance," Mr. McCarthy said, "I am not going to say there is not a grievance; I am precluded from that by the judgment." Would that our local preachers of the Gospel of Peace could have the same manliness in their sermons, which Mr. McCarthy manifested before the council at Ottawa. But it

must be granted, I am afraid, that the sense of duty does not go so far with some of them, notwithstanding their protest of "Fear of God honor the King;" as it does even with Mr. D. McCarthy. Rev. Mr. Turk calls our grievance a technical one, and in his

SPRIT OF JUSTICE he compares us to the Mennonites, who, he says, "in equity have the same right to separate schools, which they desire that the Catholics have." It would be difficult for any enemy of all that is Catholic to show greater narrowness of mind, than does this reverend gentleman in the present instance. For what rights or privileges have the Mennonites ever acquired in this country with regard to education? Were they here at the time the Manitoba act was passed? Had they done anything particular to entitle them to the consideration of the framers of the law? Had their ancestors ever been on a field of battle to save Canada to England? Had they ever sent any missionary to evangelize the poor Indians of our prairie land? When history shall transmit to the coming generations the names of the pioneers of this country, and their noble works, shall there be a page to the memory of any Mennonite apostles and their work of patriotism or of their evangelical labors? Mr. Turk should bear in mind that when a contract is passed between two parties affecting the future of such rights and privileges to a third party, whoever he may be, that may choose in after years to come and live side by side with them. There is here a question of acquired rights and privileges, which must be respected by all incomers as long as the law which guarantees those rights and privileges holds good. If Mr. Turk does not approve of the rights and privileges enjoyed by the Catholics of Manitoba let him first obtain the cancelling of the Manitoba act as advised the other day by Rev. Mr. Grant at the banquet of the Orange order in this city, and then he may be free to compare the position of Catholics with that of the Mennonites, who are settled down in Manitoba, or any other sect which may choose to come and plant its tent in this country. But until then, the Catholics, whether in the minority or not will continue to lay a claim to what is neither in the power of the pastor of Grace Church nor even of any local legislature to take away from them. The reverend gentleman goes on to say that many of our Roman Catholic fellow citizens would consider it a real grievance to go back to separate schools. If many could mean one only, I would grant to him that there exists in our midst one he might quote, and let him not be scandalized at it for there always were men of that stamp throughout the centuries since the formation of the Church of Christ. The first was found amongst the twelve chosen apostles of the Lord, and the bad seed has kept on spreading from generation to generation. But if Mr. Turk really means that there are many Catholics sharing his views I would challenge him to give the names of only half a dozen of practical Catholics in Winnipeg, 2, 3, who do not only go to church on Sunday but who receive communion at least at Easter, as a proof of his assertion, and I may then surrender, but till then I shall hold his assertion as a merely gratuitous one and, consequently, of no value whatever. With regard to his figures concerning the illgerard of Catholics in Manitoba, as he has had already to alter his statement I shall wait a little longer lest he might have some new revised list to offer in the near future, for if he has his information from the source I suspect he is not through yet with his corrections. So much for the justice of the case, let us say something now of

THE LAW OF CHARITY by which the pastor of Grace Church wanted to be guided, but which I am sorry to say he seems to have forgotten at the very outset of his sermon. How my reverend friend observes the golden rule as a motto we shall see by the reasons he brings forward to justify his protest against interference with the school system of Manitoba as now established by law: First, he says, "because by this law no injustice is done to any citizen;" we have already disposed of this reason; second, "because such interference would infringe upon provincial rights, which are sacred." To understand the amount of charity in this let us take the following illustration. Mr. Turk I will suppose, has been deprived without any notice or shadow of reason, but only to serve the ends of his despoiler, of a piece of property which he had peacefully enjoyed for twenty years back. Naturally he is greatly incensed over the outrageous piece of iniquity and as a consequence brings the matter before some of the local judges for redress. These, unfortunately, through some technical defect of the law pass a judgment adverse to the reverend gentleman's interests. But he not content with this first judgment appeals to the supreme court where ultimately a decision is rendered in his favor. Now it remains for the executive of Winnipeg to do justice to Mr. Turk, but as the order is issued for the redress, there comes an association, call it by what name you will, which says: No, this should not be done, because such interference would infringe upon local rights, which are sacred. What do you think would be the sentiments of my reverend friend? Do you suppose he would have great admiration for the charity of an association which would exercise its influence to prevent justice being done? And let not Mr. Turk say the cases are not alike, for where the law of the land provides for an appeal from an inferior to a superior court, in like manner the constitution clearly provides for similar appeal from a local to a central power in matters of education, wherever a right or privilege of the Protestant or Roman Catholic minority has been affected. But

the Pastor of Grace church in his anxiety to be just and fair to the poor Catholics of Manitoba will insist that the provincial schools act was passed to remedy a great evil. He says: "In many of the separate schools the French language was used almost exclusively, the standard of education in these schools was low, the principal training being in the Roman Catholic religion." In answer to this charge, which is but the repetition of an old slander refuted a hundred times, permit me to ask my reverend friend whether: (a) it is a crime to teach French to children born of French parents? Let him apply the same principle to those of his own language! What I can venture to say, however, is that for one child of English parentage that knows a few words of French, there are twenty or more children of French extraction that know English almost perfectly. (b) With regard to the standard of general education I would ask Mr. Turk if he made his statement from personal information, or if he has drawn his knowledge from outside sources. During these evil days, when the enemies of the church are prone to make charges which they cannot substantiate, it is not safe for a man whose motto is to do unto others as he would like others to do unto him, to trust too much to unproved assertions, even if they should serve a good purpose. And in order to convince M. Turk, that like many others he is by much too hasty to pass judgment regarding the inferiority of the Catholic schools of Manitoba, I shall take the liberty of calling his attention to the success achieved by these schools in the Intercolonial exhibition held in England in 1884. Father Cherrier here read from Archbishop Tache's two letters on the school question, pages 6 and 7. Should Mr. Turk be anxious to enter into the sphere of higher education I may perhaps be permitted to call his attention to the laurels gained by the students of the St. Boniface college year after year at the Manitoba university examinations. The university calendar being with easy reach of all who may take an interest in the matter I shall not make a special reference. Moreover, as the charge regarding the

STANDARD OF CATHOLIC EDUCATION is not limited to Manitoba but extended to Quebec, and in general to Catholic countries, I may perhaps make mention of the results obtained recently by the Catholic Quebec at the Columbian Exhibition in Chicago, where the judges were nearly, if not all, Protestants; and then shall I remark also that when Italy or Spain are charged with illiteracy very little indeed is said of the standard of fine arts in those countries, particularly the former, which is to this day considered as the land of the great masters in painting, statuary, sculpture and so forth, but let me point in particular to Catholic Belgium as a specimen of the attainment of the Catholic schools as compared with the national or state schools. Father Cherrier here quoted from a report taken from an official organ "Le Moniteur" of Belgium and continued: "What more, I pray, could be needed to convince any fair minded critic that what is charged against the standard of Catholic education exists more in the imagination of our detractors than it does in reality. For further information, however, on the subject I would invite those interested to peruse a valuable book lately published by the Paulest Fathers, entitled "Catholic and Protestant Countries Compared." (c) The pastor of Grace church is equally mistaken when he says that the principal training in our schools is in the Roman Catholic religion. It is true the Catholic teaching is an important factor in the training of the young but not as the reverend gentleman seems to insinuate to such an extent as to interfere in any way with the other branches of instruction which pertain to the general standard of education. It simply permeates the all. Let him go to the trouble of consulting the programme of studies in use in the Catholic schools prior to and since 1890 and he will have no difficulty in convincing himself of the truth of my assertion. The quantum of religion it is true, which will satisfy the Protestants at large will not equally satisfy the Catholic conscience. Rev. Mr. Turk may not readily agree to this, but if he will reflect that the fact of so many religious sects being kept out of the pale of the Catholic church, "that noble and grand institution" as he once styled it before me, is not due to this that they have retained certain points of doctrine which they hold in common with us, but to the fact that they have rejected some of the truths taught in the Roman church, he may perhaps be brought to concede that whereas the Protestants may agree upon a certain system of vague religious principles it is impossible for Catholics to do in like manner. As a Protestant Mr. Turk may be satisfied with schools that are not Godless nor distinctively Catholic, but let him know that if we object like him to Godless schools we also strongly oppose any system of schools where nothing but a teaching of no distinctive character is admitted. In other words we cannot any more agree with Mr. Turk upon any system of religious training that is not our own in schools, than I could agree to exchange pulpits with him, however, great my respect for his religious convictions. Had our Protestant clergymen in 1890, when they forced the heads of our local government to grant them instead of purely secular schools, schools with a quantum of religion acceptable to all Protestant denominations, thought of extending a charitable assistance to their Catholic fellow-citizens, much might have been avoided of the trouble which now mars the peace and harmony of the different sections of the people of Manitoba. "Conscience," says my dear friend, "is Holy ground." Therefore he would agree if a devout Catholic could not conscientiously send his children to the national schools it would constitute a grievance," but he rejects the

principle first on the ground that "one Roman Catholic citizen of Winnipeg is a trustee of national schools and has two daughters teaching, and yet declares he is in full communion with the Roman Catholic church." To this I answer that although I am not appointed judge over that Roman Catholic citizen of Winnipeg, with whom I am in no-wise concerned, I am perfectly free to state here that it is not the fact of any individual declaring that he is in full communion with the Roman Catholic church that will make me believe him to be such if I have good reasons to be convinced that it is not. At all times the church has had children protesting of their faithfulness to her teaching, whilst in reality, and unknowingly, perhaps, with some of them, on account of want of better knowledge, they were made

TOOLS OF INIQUITY in the lands of her enemies. But the Rev. M. Turk will insist, and therefore he argues: "Many Roman Catholic dignitaries have expressed themselves as if not opposed to Catholic schools, and so I mistake not, has the Pope himself." Well, let us see what the views of the church are with regard to education. In order to avoid being too long, I shall only quote from the third council of Baltimore, some of the decrees which bear the most strongly upon the question:

THIRD COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE. No. 194, page 99—"Men moved entirely by spirit of the world have returned, in order to extend education to civil society or to submit to the secular power, and take from the church the charge of teaching the Catholic youth, that charge reserved from Christ (Matt. xxviii, 19, Mark x, 14); the mode of education, which aims chiefly at directing towards future life and eternal beatitude, seems to some stupid and useless, while others think it ought to be abolished as pernicious. Page 1xxxi—"Popular education has always been a chief object of the church's care; in fact it is not too much to say that the history of the church's work is the history of education and civilization. In the rude ages, when the semi-barbarous chiefs boasted of their illiteracy, she succeeded in diffusing that love of learning which covered Europe with schools and universities; and thus, from the barbarous times of early middle ages, she built up the civilized nations of modern times. No. 196, pages 100 and 101—"Not only out of our paternal love do we exhort Catholic parents, but we commend them by all the authority we possess to procure a truly beloved off-spring given them by God, to be again in baptism unto Christ and destined for heaven to shield and secure them through childhood and youth from the dangers of merely worldly education, and therefore to send them to parochial or other truly Catholic schools, unless in particular cases the local bishop judges that he could permit otherwise." No. 197, pages 101 and 102—"In the estimation of all there is nothing more necessary for the Catholics than to have in every locality their own schools, and that they should not be inferior to public schools. Consequently Catholic schools must be established where there are none, enlarged, constructed and equipped with all that is necessary. All care must be taken that the public schools, in instruction and teaching with No. 197, page 102—"It may be useful to cite the encyclical letter of Pope Leo XIII. to the bishops of France. 'The church always condemned openly the schools which call mixed or neutral, informing the fathers and mothers to keep on their guard in a matter of such a useful thing, which the church wealth is, safeguarded in a most excellent manner.' No. 210, page 112—"If parents are forced to send their children to non-Catholic schools, we strongly advise them to remove as far as possible from their danger to their faith and morals, remembering always the words of the Master: 'What does it profit a man to gain the whole world and lose his own soul?'" (Matt. xvi, 26.)"

That these are in perfect harmony with the teaching of the Pope can very easily be ascertained by referring to the instructions prepared by the congregation of the propaganda on public schools and approved in 1875 by Pius IX, and XIII; with order to communicate them to all the bishops of the United States of America. A copy of the same was also attached as an appendix to the decrees of the first council of our ecclesiastical province of St. Boniface. I now leave it with the pastor of Grace church to consider how far in conscience a devout Catholic is free to accept the Manitoba public schools as they have been made the provisions of the constitution when by devout Catholic is entitled to schools wherein he may have his children receive a truly Catholic education. One my reverend friend's sermon where he says that "before the national schools stand by and see their money expended in building up the Roman Catholic domination." This, brethren, is so far the afraid to say, the most unwarrantable has thought himself in charity bound to make against the Catholic minority attempt to prove his assertions by figures, which prima facie are quite of a nature. However, I think he really attempted to prove his charge as have been taught by experience how fallacious statements can be obtained from statistics, when not put forward in their proper light. M. Turk says: "Protestants under the old system were compelled to stand by and see their money expended in building up the Roman Catholic denomination." To any one that is at all conversant with the working of the old school law criticism of even the most favorably inclined to think as Mr. Turk does on the school question. It was, as a matter of fact, clearly provided in the old law that in no case could a Protestant ratepayer be assessed for the support of a Catholic school, nor a Catholic ratepayer for the support of a Protestant school. There remained the money levied on corporate bodies and the money voted as the legislative grant, both of which were apportioned between Protestants and Catholics according to the number of children of school age. Now as my reverend friend in his figures grant let us consider from a point of

view more just than the one he takes, to what extent the children attending As it would be rather long to consult the reports of a number of years, I shall limit myself to the reports of 1886 and 1887 which I happen to just lay my hand upon. In 1886 the legislative grant for the Protestant section of the board of age attendance was \$38,658, with a total average attendance at school of 8,611 children, which means a grant of \$4.49 for each attending child. For the same year the Catholic section of the board received \$12,267. The average attendance was 3,075, stowing a grant of \$3.98 for each attending child, in other words, received. In 1887 the grant made to Protestants was \$44,889 for an average attendance of 9,715, or \$4.62 per child; \$12,949, for an average attendance of 3,569, or \$3.60 per child, being \$1.02 for each child less than was given to Protestants. In 1888 the grant to Protestants was \$66,274, with an average attendance of 9,556, being per pupil, \$6.74, whilst the Catholics received \$15,050, with an average attendance of 3,648, showing \$4.37 for each child, or \$2.37 per child less than the Protestants received. This is an instance of the language of figures, which brings to light facts not altogether very palatable for my reverend friend. But how he could have arrived at

THE STASTLING FIGURES which he produces in his sermon is the question which remains to be answered. In my honest opinion it is simply due to this that he has made his calculations on the average expenditure of the legislative grant on each school district without taking into account the number of pupils in attendance, the number of teachers, and the other expenses in connection with the general working of the school machinery. Now, everybody knows, and some of our local Protestant dignitaries have repeatedly acknowledged that their teachers and professors are as a rule better provided with children than our Protestant neighbors, and also that the Catholic school districts are on an average provided with a larger number of pupils than are the Protestant school districts. As an instance of this, in 1888, there were 495 Protestant school districts in operation in the province, with an average total attendance of 9,956 or 19.91 per district, as against 64 Catholic districts equally in operation, with an average total attendance of 3,648 or 57 per district. Such being the case who could reasonably deny that a school district with an average attendance of 57, should, according to the fair apportionment of the legislative grant on a basis of attendance, receive almost three times as much as another school district that has only 19.1. Now let us apply the principle to Mr. Turk's figures, and we shall readily understand that the giving of \$347.03 to a school district that has an average attendance of 57, is only for another school district with but 19.91 of an average attendance. The difference in the figures given regarding the salaries of teachers simply follows as a consequence of the principle involved. And as a further consequence there, permit me to say, lies also the fallacy of my reverend friend's figures. In conclusion let me assure the pastor of Grace church, his fellow members of the Methodist Ministerial association as well as all others who may share his views, that the Catholics, while advocating the redress of a grievance under which they have been laboring since 1890, are in no way concerned with the school acts as passed and accepted by the majority in the province as best suited to these. Let the majority therefore enjoy themselves a system of schools which they consider as best for them; but I cannot and will not cease to demand that the minority be reinstated in their rights and privileges which, by the constitution and the law of the land, they enjoyed prior to 1890 in this our common province of Manitoba. Let there be no fear regarding the

LOYALTY OF THE CATHOLICS of this country; their past history is more than security for the future. Always have we been happy to live under the British flag, and unto death shall we remain faithful to our allegiance to our Gracious Queen on whose empire the sun never sets; yes unto death shall we "Honor the King." But let us also be allowed to teach our children as we think best, how to "Fear God," by instilling in their young minds and hearts the principles of that religion which has made us not only true Christians, members of the church, but also devoted subjects of the British crown. Our motto for the future shall be "Fear God, Honor the King," and let me call also upon all my fellow-citizens who are truly willing to do unto others as they would have others to do unto them, let me entreat our friends without distinction of creed or nationality, to unite and give the Catholic minority of this country the brotherly assistance they need in this their present struggle to regain the rights and privileges which, I repeat, by the constitution and the law of the land were guaranteed to them; and whilst for the time being these our friends of the hour shall be entitled to our hearty gratitude, I may assure them that they shall, if ever the occasion should demand, find us ready to do unto them as we now call upon them to do unto us.