The Catholic Record
Published Weekly at 486 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.
REV. JOHN F. COFFEY, Editor.
THOS. COFFEY, Publisher & Proprietor.

Ottawa Agency:
P. J. COFFEY, Gen'l Agent, 74 George St.

RATES PER ANNUM.—One Copy, $2.00; Three Copies, $5.25; Five Copies, $7.50; Ten Copies, $12.50 Payable in every case in advance.

Advertising rates made known on application.

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

All correspondence addressed to the Publisher will receive prompt attention.

Arrears must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

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

Catholic Record.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 21, 1884.

THE BIBLE IN SCHOOLS.

Our readers are well acquainted with the position we have taken in the matter of religious instruction in schools. We have endeavored, very feebly, we must admit, but in terms as plain as we could command, to set forth the Catholic view on this most vital and important subject. We are now happy to perceive that our Protestant fellow-citizens, who, for some time, have been giving earnest consideration to this subject, so fraught with grave consequences to our future as a people, are taking vigorous measures to have inaugurated some system of religious instruction in schools. At the late Presbyterian Assembly in Toronto,

Hon A. Morris moved "That the General Assembly, under deep conviction of the importance of the education of the young being founded on Christian truth, and fully sympathizing with the action of the Synod of the Diocese of Toronto with a view to imparting religious instruction in the Public Schools, appoint a Committee to co-operate with any committee which may be appointed by the Synod or any other branch of the Christian Church seeking to attain that end."

The motion was adopted.

The following were appointed a Committee on the subject:—Rev. Dr. Laing (Convener), Rev. Dr. Gregg, Rev. J. K. Smith, Rev. K. McLennan, Rev. Principal Grant, Rev. Principal Caven, Rev. H. M. Parsons, S. Lyle, W. T. McMullen, Messrs. Blaikie, C. Davidson, MacLennan, Q. C., H. Cassels, and Dr. McDonald.

The mover of this resolution, unanimously adopted by the representatives of an ecclesiastical body having more than 600,000 persons in its membership, is one of the most prominent gentlemen in Canadian public life. He has served as Lieutenant-Governor of a Province, as a member of the Dominion Cabinet, is yet a Privy Councillor for Canada, and a leading member of the Parliament of Ontario. The Committee appointed under the motion includes the names of men identified with the learning, respectability and influence of Canadian Presbyterianism. The adoption of such a motion places the Presbyterian body on record as an advocate of religious education in schools.

Then, at the Anglican Synod of Toronto on the 12th of June, took place a discussion on the same subject that has attracted our attention:

Rev. A. J. Fiddler moved the resolution which he had proposed last year:—"That a committee be appointed to examine the question of the possibility of obtaining the power to establish Separate Schools for the children of Church of England families in cities and towns, and to report next year, and recommend a course of action in the matter." (Cries of "withdraw.") He would not withdraw. The lack of religious training in the schools led to disastrous results in the spread of infidelity and even atheism, and something ought to be done by the Church to counterbalance the evil influence. It might be said that there was preaching everywhere. So there was, but the effect was generally mere sensationalism, not teaching. The home training in religious matters, which was one of the advantages of children of some years ago, was almost altogether neglected. Passing through school and going to national university or college, the young men were there without religious instruction. The difficulty was recognized by nearly all religious denominations, and nearly every one sought to establish colleges where religious training was one of the features of the education. If there were separate schools for one denomination there was no reason why there should not be for another. If there were enough Church of England people in one locality to establish a school, was it not unjust that the majority should prevent them from doing so if they wished? He dwelt at some length upon the great lack of religious teaching in the rising generation.

The motion was seconded by Rev. John Carry, who, to show the necessity of the change proposed, instanced the New England States, where the common school system had been in operation longer than anywhere else, and in which, through the crimes of the people, there was an average of only one child in a family. Rome in its worst days was not half so bad. To say that a common school education would make people religious was treason to Jesus Christ. He knew graduates of the public schools who did not even know the names of the patriarchs. If they were to have a religious people they must have religious training of the children.

Rev. Mr. Lewis dwelt upon the prevalent irreligion among the young, and said he thought the Church ought to take a high stand on this matter. The religious instruction in the schools should be under the charge of those most interested in it, and those most interested were the clergy.

Hon. Edward Blake maintained that the first thing to be considered with reference to the Public Schools in this connection is whether they could not get the various Christian denominations, Protestant and Roman Catholic, to agree upon a collection of passages of Scripture which should not merely be read, but which should be learned by the children in the schools and repeated there. (Applause.) A large portion of the voluntary work in the Sunday School and preparation for the Sunday School would thus be done. The reading of the Scripture, whether by the teacher or the teacher and scholars responsively was a good thing but it was not enough. While the mind of the child was receptive it should be stored with the most precious passages of scripture which would be a treasury on which to draw in after years. (Loud applause) He agreed that they could not expect to impart religious instruction after school hours. The school hours were already in many cases too long (applause), more could be learned in a shorter time. To keep the children at school an hour longer one or two days in the week for religious instruction would mean that they were to be penalized on those days. (Applause.) Let the secular lessons close an hour earlier one or two days in the week and the religious instruction be imparted in the time thus gained. Rev. Mr. Lewis said they ought to take the highest ground, but in confining this motion to the cities and towns they were making a concession to the practicable, and he asked that the practicable should be kept in view throughout. If they asked frankly and freely and generously, and with open heart to the other denominations on this subject, they would solve the difficulty. (Applause.) Some thought the Government should take the matter in hand. Did they suppose that any Government would not be anxious to carry out this reform, if it could be done? The difficulty was in the unhappy divisions in the Christian world. (Renewed applause). Why could they not heal them? He believed the common ground was wider than that now occupied. (Loud and long applause).

Mr. Fiddler's resolution was not adopted, but not one of the speakers took ground against the principle affirmed in his motion. Mr. Blake commits himself fully to this principle, and even goes so far as to lay down a proposal on the subject. Mr. Blake has profound and honest convictions on this important question. He favors religious instruction in the schools, and has evidently devoted time and thought to the matter. At the annual commencement of Toronto University a few days before Mr. Blake had, even in terms more clear and emphatic, laid down his views on this same subject. He then said:

"Now, if I may be permitted to say a word on another subject it is this: I feel that there has been an attempt in that same speech to which I have twice referred, by the Archbishop of Canterbury, to intermingle the questions of the common school education and the university education, and we have had an account as inaccurate as it was possible for an account to be of the position of that question so far as it was in controversy. I want to make one practical proposal with reference to religion in the schools, and I maintain if this proposal is not acceptable to the denominations it is to be regretted, and it proves in the plainest way the impossibility of such a system on any other basis. I see no reason why the heads of the various denominations of this country, Protestant and Catholic, should not unite in a selection of passages of Sacred Writ without note or comment, which it should be the duty of the masters to set for the scholars to learn and to repeat daily in the public schools of the land. I think it perfectly possible in the present more happy sentiment which prevails among those of different religious creeds, for such a combination to be made by them. The State cannot make it: it cannot attempt it; and if those who call for religion in the public schools will meet together and will agree that certain passages may be learned and repeated without note or comment, without exposition or explanation by the master—leaving that to the pastor or parent at home or in church—then that can be done which would be of very great consequence. It is of the last consequence, not merely that the Bible should be read, but that while the memory is young, fresh, and retentive its words should be stored in the mind, which will then retain the impression. If that can be done, much will be done; if that cannot be done by common consent of the denominations, I ask you what can be done?"

We are glad, indeed, to count such men as Mr. Blake and Mr. Morris in our public life, as advocates of religious instruction in our schools, such representative and influential bodies as the General Assembly of the Presbyterian church of Canada and the Synod of Toronto as placing themselves on record in favor of this salutary principle. It does, however, at this moment recur to our minds that when twenty years ago and more the Catholics of Ontario were battling for religious education they received but little sympathy from the religious bodies that now affirm this Catholic principle. The bishops and the priests of this Province were lampooned and calumniated, and the Catholic body subjected to a social and political persecution reflecting disgrace on its authors. Pulpit and platform and press then resounded with denunciations of Catholicism and of Catholics. And had it not been for the assistance of our Lower Canadian friends, we of the Catholic minority of Ontario would still be bound to the chariot wheels of religious oppression and educational despotism. We are not yet fully freed from their shackles, but the time is coming, it is at hand, when, casting them off, we will stand as free men should stand, on perfect terms of equality with our fellow-citizens of every other class, condition and denomination. We are, we repeat, happy to see leading Protestant clergymen and laymen now openly asserting a principle long since affirmed and maintained by the Catholic Church. How strikingly in accord are the utterances of our Protestant fellow-citizens and friends with the truths laid down some years ago by a venerated prelate of the English Catholic Church, the Most Rev. Dr. Hedley. That pious and devoted churchman says:—

"As the child is, so the man or woman will be. Religion is the same in its essentials for little ones and for grown-up people. The same God, the same heart, the same hindrances, the same responsibility, the same life eternal. But unless the seeds have been sown in childhood, there will be little fruit in mature years. Indeed, with all our schooling, we see too many grow up irreligious and immoral, regardless of decency and forgetful of God. Therefore, the Christian parent and pastor and teacher are anxious and busy about Christian education. Some say, "Let the child choose its religion for itself, when it can think and look about the world." This is like saying "Straighten the tree, after it has grown crooked for years." You cannot do it. The crook is in the very fibre. You can only break it. A child not brought up religiously sucks in irreligion, because the absence of the knowledge and the love of God is not only the absence of religion, but the opposite of religion. If a thing is not white, it must be some other color. You cannot have a thing no color at all. If you take a child no older than ten, eleven or twelve, which has had hitherto no religious teaching, you will not find its mind a blank, or its heart an empty chamber; far from it. Its mind will be all written over, and the writing there will be: Thou shalt love thyself the first; thou shalt labor and strive for this world alone; thou shalt measure good and evil only by pleasure and pain; thou shalt have no heed for the things that are unseen. And its heart will be full of rank weeds of selfishness; of unworthy interests; of big passions, growing up strong and vicious, like vipers in their nest; of anger, hatred, and ill-will. Even the love of parents, of family, of neighbors, even justice, and sweetness, and kindness, even these will be dwarfed in a heart that knows not God, to the smallness of human feelings, with no elevation to heaven, with no tinge of the grace of Calvary, with no brightness from the life to come. When you bring God and the Gospel to a heart like this, you are too late."

Twelve years ago, His Lordship the Bishop of London, in a pastoral of great clearness and power discussed the whole question of religious education. The perusal of that pastoral at this moment would lead us to believe that His Lordship must have been gifted with a prophetic vision of the present state of the question. It deals with the solution now proposed in terms most clear, effective and, to our mind, unanswerable.

"The education taught in the common schools of Ontario is not truly religious or Christian. It is true that it is asserted that religion is not ignored in these schools, since Christian morality is inculcated and the Bible is read therein, although, of course, the distinctive doctrines of each Christian denomination are not, and cannot be taught in them. But we hold that religion without dogma is not Christianity, and that the flowers of Christian morality and virtue can only flourish and bloom under the shelter of the well-defined doctrines of Christ. Christian morality cannot be taught without a knowledge of Christ, and that again necessarily involves a knowledge of His person, His history, His teaching, His commandments, and His Church; it involves, in other words, Christianity in its entirety and completeness. In what schools soever then the distinctive doctrines of our holy religion are not taught, Christian morality cannot be taught; and when Christian morality is not taught, the heart, and conscience, and will of the young are like a neglected field overgrown with rank and poisonous weeds. The morality inculcated in common schools must necessarily be based on the assumption that all Christian denominations are equally good, an assumption which, of course, is utterly untrue, and must necessarily result in religious indifferentism. The morality inculcated in common schools, if these schools be impartial to all sects, must be based on the assumption that all Christian sects are equally good. But we hold that, with justice to all Christian sects, it is impossible that the education imparted in common schools could be religious, for, as the London Times has lately said, "If education is to be religious at all, it must be at variance with the teaching of some denominations." The mere choice of a version of Scripture is enough to make the school sectarian. The Bible may be read in these schools, but though "all scripture inspired of God is profitable to teach, to reprove, to correct, to instruct unto justice,"—(Tim 2nd v., 3rd c.,) it is only so when interpreted by the infallible Church of Christ, to whom belong the Scriptures and the true meaning thereof; for, if interpreted by fallible private judgment, it may be "wrested to the eternal ruin and perdition of its readers,"—(Peter, 2nd ep., 3rd c., 16v.,) and is sure to beget innumerable jarring and discordant sects, speaking a very Babel of tongues, tearing into shreds the seamless garment of Christ, and by their wranglings and contentions bringing Christianity itself into contempt."

"It is not," says Demaistre, "the reading of the Scripture, but the teaching of it by infallible authority that is useful; the gentle dove," he continues, "taking the grain in its bill, breaking it in parts, and then distributing it to its young, is a natural image of the Church explaining the true meaning of the written word to her children. Read without notes and an authoritative explanation, the holy Scripture may prove a deadly poison." Hence the Catholic Church considers the reading of Scripture by children as an inadequate means of imparting to them a religious instruction, and as a usage whereby the word of God is exposed to irreverence, and the young in danger of misunderstanding its meaning, and of thereby receiving impressions most injurious to the salvation of their souls.

There is another consideration to be added here: it is the baneful impressions that may be made on the young mind by non-Catholic teachers. The child is naturally disposed to respect the teacher, to look up to him as the embodiment of wisdom and a prodigy of learning, and to consider his words as oracular utterances, not to be questioned for a moment. It is easy then to see what fatal, and perhaps lasting impressions may be made on pupils by a casual expression, a suggestive hint, a sneer at Popish practices, a general tone of contempt for Catholic usages, indulged in by a teacher who is not a Catholic. We ourselves have heard on good authority that in a certain common school in this Diocese, which several Catholic children attended, the teacher asked in a loud voice:—"Who bow down before images and adore them?" and the answer of course was "the Papists!"

Hence the Bishops of Canada, in the first Provincial Synod of Quebec assembled, decreed as follows:—"Mixed schools, in which the children of the faithful, promiscuously mix with the children of non-Catholics, are taught none, or a false religion—we adjudge entirely dangerous, as being calculated to beget that plague of impiety commonly called indifferentism. Wherefore we earnestly exhort the pastors of souls to do all in their power to prevent Catholic children from attending them. But if, in some localities, in which no Catholic schools exist, Catholic children are obliged to attend the mixed schools, let pastors and parents take great care lest such children insensibly imbibing the poison of error, should suffer the loss of their faith and their purity."

Common schools, therefore, are not such as Catholic parents can, in conscience and in justice to their children, patronize or encourage; and we hereby declare that Catholic parents cannot, in conscience, send their children to such schools, save in the absence of Catholic schools, and even then both pastors and parents, in the words of the above cited decree, must take the greatest care lest the children sent to such schools should suffer the loss of their faith and their purity.

Unchristian education is the very well-head of the impure waters of impiety and unbelief that deluge this century. And how can it be otherwise? The stream that flows from an impure fountain must be itself impure; the education that ignores the eternal world, and the sacred truths revealed by God and taught by his own true church, may sharpen the intellect and quicken the mental powers, but it will leave the heart a moral wilderness, and must of necessity generate religious indifferentism and unbelief."

The arguments here set forth by the Bishop of London are, we repeat, unanswerable. The true doctrine of religious education in schools is defined, and the insufficiency of mere biblical recitation and instruction calmly, but irresistibly, discovered and condemned.

We regret to be obliged to differ from a gentleman of the scholarly attainments, great talent and earnest convictions of Mr. Blake, but we do feel that as a Catholic journalist, subject, of course, to correction at the hands of our ecclesiastical superiors, we should enter a stern protest against the use of the Bible as a text book in our schools. There is in this matter a question of the highest principle at stake. It is asked of Catholic children to join in scriptural reading for purposes of religious education with the children of Protestant parents. Bible reading with Protestants is an act of religious worship, with Catholics it is not. The Bible with Protestants is accepted as a rule of faith and morals—with Catholics it is not. Then coming to details, can Catholic children in conscience use, or parents permit them to use, a biblical text book as taught by a Protestant master? Or can Catholic children in any case use the Protestant version of the Bible as the word of God?

One of the very worst effects of the use of the bible as a text book were to create in the minds of Catholic children a feeling that all religion has its basis in the bible, and that all forms of religion recognizing the bible as the word of God are equally good. It is idle, in our estimation, to speak of using a text-book of biblical selections, without note or comment, as unobjectionable to Catholics. No text-book can be used in any school without comment from the teachers. And it is but natural to expect that the children themselves will from time to time ask explanations of texts of which they seize not the meaning. Thus the school-room would be turned into a field of biblical disputation. This is a question of deepest concern to Catholics. There must be more than fifty thousand Catholic children in attendance in the Province at public schools. It is therefore a question of the gravest moment to the Catholics of Ontario whether or not the bible is to be forced on these children as their rule of morality. Father Konings, the eminent theologian, dealing with this question maintains, (1) that it is doubtful whether Catholic parents, save in exceptional cases, can be absolved who send their children to schools wherein the bible is not indeed used as a text book, but wherein the master—a Catholic—reads selections from the Protestant version conformable to the Catholic version. He assigns as a reason for this opinion that any such use of the Protestant bible is an acknowledgment of its authority, and would imply that it is a rule of morality for the children. He further declares (2) that parents cannot be absolved who send their children to schools where they are obliged to recite hymns or prayers even containing nothing heretical, if these hymns and prayers are looked on as constituting an act of religion.* Now, from the declarations of Mr. Blake and other advocates of the bible in public schools, its reading in these schools must constitute an act of religion. They tell us that religious instruction is needed in the schools. This we cheerfully admit. But when we ask, how do you propose to meet the want, they tell us, by the reading of a book which we do not recognize as the word of God, and which we cannot admit as a rule of faith or morality. The very moment a text-book of selections from the Protestant version of the bible is forced into the hands of Catholic children, they are compelled to acknowledge that it is from the bible they are to receive religious guidance and moral training. Any consequence more deplorable, from the Catholic standpoint, cannot well be imagined. What would our Protestant friends say if the Catholics of Lower Canada were to force on Protestant children attending mixed schools in that Province the study of the *Petit Catechisme de Quebec*, which is a clearer compendium of faith and morality than the Protestant bible. Why, all Canada would ring with indignation. From Cape Breton to Vancouver we should hear of nothing but the despotism and intolerance of Rome. Well, it is something fully as ill-judged and as repugnant to the feelings of the Catholic minority in Ontario that the advocates of bible reading propose to do. They, in effect, say to the Catholics of Ontario, "We look on our bible as the word of God, it is our rule of faith, and our guide in morals, and because it is our rule and our guide, it should be so for you."

This is a position which neither Mr. Blake nor any of the advocates of bible reading will, we know, care to assume. Yet, in our eyes, this is their attitude, an attitude indefensible and untenable. This, we think, should be a land of religious freedom. But this it cannot be if any attempt whatever be made to inflict injustice on the Catholic minority of Ontario. Let the Protestant majority use the bible, let them have it read in the public school, let them have their children commit it to memory—and no Catholic will complain. But what we do firmly maintain is that the public school will cease to be a school which Catholics can frequent where biblical reading, biblical instruction, and biblical lessons are made obligatory. We shall rejoice to see public morality elevated among our Protestant fellow-citizens by the use of the bible in schools as a text book. We know that many of them are earnest, honest and sincere in their advocacy of religious education, and we respect them for their earnestness, honesty and sincerity. At the same time, we feel hearty satisfaction in assuring them that Catholics look upon their church as their sole rule of faith and guide of morality, a living rule and a never-failing guide. From no other source can religious instruction be imparted, and by no other authority can they conscientiously permit their children to be taught that which they must believe, and that which they must do, to lead lives in accord with the teachings of Christ and to save their immortal souls.

*CASUS VI. Dubitari potest an absolvi valeant parentes, qui filios committunt scholis, in quibus ludimagister Catholicus ex protestantica aliqua Bibliorum versione (qua tamen pueri non utantur) ea tantum prælegit, quæ versioni catholicæ sint conformia. Et ratio quidem dubitandi est, quod qui versione protestantica utitur, et ejus auctoritatem agnoscere,—cum eam ut Verbum Dei prælegere censeatur, — et pueris eam in normam proponere videatur. Si tamen vel pueros lateat eum versione protestantica uti, vel ex protestatione explicita ludimagistri, vel ex adjunctis satis pateat ipsum auctoritatem ejusdem non agnoscere et dura compulsum necessitate ita agere, absolutionem neque ludimagistro, neque parentibus denegarem; tunc enim allata dubitandi ratio non amplius subsistet. Suppono tamen scholam aliis de causis non esse vitandam, et assumo benignæ Matris Ecclesiæ mentem non esse Bibliorum protestanticorum prohibitionem ita velle urgere, ut iis etiam in adjunctis, in quibus lex sua nociva fieret, non liceret ea vel materialiter manibus tenere, ut quæ conformia sunt Biblis Catholicis ex iis prælegantur.

438.—CASUS VII. Quid, si pueri recitare cogantur cantica aut preces sectarum, sed ejusmodi tantum, quæ nihil hæretici contineant, ut e. g. formulam Orationis Dominicæ cum addito: "nam tuum est regnum," etc.?

Parentes, qui filios hujusmodi scholis instituendos tradunt, non possunt absolvi, si cantica et preces hujusmodi adhibeantur, ut objectum actus religiosi, et non, quemadmodum sæpe cantica, ut objectum recreationis vel doctrinæ naturalis. Permitti tamen posset istiusmodi scholæ frequentatio pueris, qui ab omni ad preces et cantiones istas cooperatione abstinerent; ita enim agendo contra illas protestarentur. Quis vero hoc a pueris expectet?

[THEOLOGIA MORALIS. — Novissimi Ecclesiæ Doctoris, S. Alphonsi, in compendium redacta, et usui venerabilis cleri Americani accommodata, Auctore A. Konings, C. SS. R., Editio Quarta. Auctior et emendatior. Vol. I., p. 196.]

CLERICAL INFLUENCE.

Mr. Huntington has written a book. We have not read it, nor is it likely that we will read it. But lest it might be thought we did the author an injustice, we propose to cite a friendly review of the work and then deal with the purpose of the author as admitted by the review. In the Ottawa Free Press of a late date, "Prof. Conant," for so the new book is termed, is dealt with in friendliest terms. "The principal object in Mr. Huntington's novel," says the writer in the Free Press, "seems to be a rebuke of the interference by the Catholic clergy in the political elections which occur in Quebec province; and an object which grew upon the author as he proceeded, rather than being his original purpose. Whether this be so or not in the author's conception, it will be so in the reader's."

The hero of the story and his position towards the clergy, and their relations with him, are thus delineated by the same friendly critic:

"The one character who elicits the reader's sympathy is a young French Canadian named De Luynes. He is a devout Catholic, untainted by the skepticism of the age, but, nevertheless, one who would draw the line of the priest's public duties strictly at the functions of his spiritual office. As a true Liberal he favored an exercise of the spirit of religious tolerance as well as a formal and legal adherence to its profession. For these views he became, as his father had been before him, a marked man by the clergy. His eloquence, his superior education, his lofty sentiment, his noble aspirations for his country's welfare and his devotion to the spiritual welfare of his church, pleaded for him in vain: and he was driven from political life. To Quebec Rouges such events as these are not unknown; and probably Mr. Huntington's own observations in the province brought many such instances to his personal knowledge. The causes are not far to seek. They were not so much due to the belief of the leading ecclesiastical prelates, that the political opinions of the Rouges were likely to injure the strength and standing of the church, as they were to the fact that the ecclesiastical leaders had family connections or near blood alliances in the leaders of the Bleu faction. The fulminations of Rome against the socialist and communist elements of Europe, whom it designated under the common name of Liberals, forgetting that in Great Britain and Canada an important political party, whose principles had led its leaders to bestow civil and religious liberty upon the adherents of the Roman Catholic Church, was known under that name, was made to do service in behalf of the Bleu faction. Clergymen so far forgot their duty to truth and honor as to distort those fulminations to apply specially to the Rouge party and its leaders, notwithstanding that they were, as De Luynes was, devoted adherents of the church, and whose loyalty to its spiritual supremacy was beyond suspicion. It was a political trick played by the ecclesiastics and their adherents whose relatives were political leaders in the Bleu party. It was for a long time a successful trick and one which threatened to strangle the love of political liberty which is as indigenous in the Frenchman's heart as in the Englishman's."

Assuming, then, as we may safely assume, that the Free Press is exact in its delineation of the good qualities of Mr. Huntington's hero, we may state that we cannot reconcile with a "devout" Catholic "untainted with the scepticism of the age," a purpose to draw the line of the priest's public duties strictly at the functions of his spiritual office. The "devout" Catholic knows that there is in the Church an authority to define the priest's public duties just as occasion demands and circumstances require. He knows too that the functions of the priest's spiritual office require him to express not only opinion, but counsel and most earnest exhortation to his flock in the exercise of their political rights. In a word, the devout De Luynes of Mr. Huntington is an imaginary and impossible character. We have some acquaintance with Lower Canadian politics and cannot recall the name of any one with the attributes of De Luynes banished from political life. We fully admit, however, that we do know of several liberals, good Catholics, who have had to suffer injustice at the hands of unprincipled men who used the sacred name of religion to further their own ends. But we know not any man condemned by the clergy who deserved not such condemnation. Allusion is made to the family connections and blood alliances of prominent ecclesiastics with the leaders of the Bleu party. As a matter of fact several of the prominent ecclesiastics of Lower Canada are also allied by ties of blood and family to leading liberal politicians, or to men who once were so, and those very ecclesiastics who took, or were accused of taking, most decided ground against the liberals of Lower Canada, have had no blood or family connection with the leading politicians opposed to that party. We admit that it were unjust to apply to the liberals of Lower Canada, as a party, the condemnations pronounced on the liberals of the continent of Europe, but that there are individual members of the party who deserve such condemnation no one who knows anything of Lower Canada can deny. And these men, who have been deservedly punished because of their profession of bad principles, by not having been honored with political preferment, loudly denounce the clergy. We certainly cannot be accused of sympathy with the political conservatism of Lower Canada, but we do say that had the clergy not denounced these men they would