E 16, 1894.

A FALLS

ILES OF THE
Y IN THE WORLD,
e NIAGARA RIVER
N to CHIPPAWA
THE—
k & River Railway
Electric Line on the
nent.
oke. No Cinders.
ate's walk from the
nk Depot.
ation Cars:
Brock's Monument,
The Whirlpool and
k, Whirlpool Rapids,
d Horseshoe Falls,
rin Islands,
he Falls, and all the
ties of that
ma of Nature.
ts of interest.
d Societies furnished
odation, and special
ication by mail or in
ACKENZIE, Manager,
Niagara Falls, Ont.

TRACTORS.

essed to the undersigned
rs for Works," will be re-
nent until noon on Mon-
stant, for the following

ast Iron Pipes, Lon-
Infirmary Hamilton
e Disposal Works,
n; Reservoir, Barn
ghter House, Piggery,
team and Hot Water
ylie Asylum; Exten-
er, Addition to Boiler
eam Boiler, Orillia
nd Hot Water Boiler,
ate.

ations can be seen at
except those for the s the
s, which can be seen an
specifications at this
ms of tender can be
cheque, made payable to
$100 for each of the above
e Infirmary, Hamilton, and
Brockville, for which an
ue for $500 made payable to
be required. The cheques
rties tendering will be re-
ignature and business ad-
es as sureties, should accom-
rill not be bound to accept
nder.
WM. HARTY,
Commissioner.
lie Works, Ont.,
11th, 1894. 817-2

RS FOR COAL.

will receive tenders, to be
at their Office in the Parlia-
Toronto, and marked "Ten-
to noon on
25TH DAY OF JUNE,
1894.
f the following quantities of
f the Institutions named be-
the 15TH DAY OF AUGUST
regards the coal for the Lon-
Asylums and Central Prison,
R INSANE, TORONTO.
tons large egg size, 100 tons
nut size. Soft coal—450 tons
100 tons hard screenings, 100
gs.
OR INSANE, LONDON.
tons large egg size, 300 tons
stove size, 75 tons chestnut
75 tons for grates. Of the 2,000
y not be required till January,
R INSANE, KINGSTON.
0 tons large eggs size, 200 tons
tons stove size, 20 tons chest-
hard screenings, 325 tons soft
R INSANE, HAMILTON.
0 tons small egg size, 174 tons
chestnut size Soft coal—35
lump for grates, 6 tons Reyn-
ump house, 300 tons small egg
ve quantity 1,300 tons may not
January, 1895.
OR INSANE, MIMICO.
0 tons large egg size, 150 tons
lump, 25 tons; hard screen-
oft screenings, 350 tons.
OR IDIOTS, ORILLIA.
100 tons large egg size, 50 tons
coal, 100 tons.
INSANE, BROCKVILLE.
00 tons large egg size.
L PRISON, TORONTO.
50 tons nut size, Soft coal —
00 tons, Straitsville preferred.
be delivered in lots of 150 tons
OR DEAF AND DUMB,
BELLEVILLE.
25 tons large egg size, 85 tons
15 tons stove size, 30 tons No. 4
for grates, 4 tons.
ON FOR BLIND, BRANT-
FORD.
5 tons egg size, 125 tons stove
estnut size. Soft coal, 5 tons for
ER REFORMATORY.
0 tons small egg size, 100 tons
d to be Fittston, Scranton, Lack-
al Stock. Tenderers are to name
nes from which they propose to
, and to designate the quality of
f required will have to produce
idence that the coal delivered
be effected satisfactory to the
he respective institutions.
be received for the whole quan-
ecified or for the quantities re-
institution.
cheque for $500, payable to the
n. the Provincial Secretary, must
y each tenderer as a guarantee of
and two sufficient sureties will
the due fulfilment of each con-
s and forms and conditions of
be obtained from the Bursars of
institutions.
r any tender not necessarily ac-
R. CHRISTI,
T. F. CHAMBERLAIN,
JAMES NOXON.
Prisons and Public Charities,
t Buildings.
t., June 9, 1894. 817-2

The Catholic Record.

"Christianus mihi nomen est, Catholicus vero Cognomen."—(Christian is my Name, but Catholic my Surname.)—St. Pacian, 4th Century.

VOLUME XVI. LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, JUNE 23, 1894. NO. 818.

A LETTER FROM ARCHBISHOP CLEARY TO THE TORONTO "GLOBE."

To the Editor of the Globe:

Sir — In the midst of grave and pressing ecclesiastical duties now engaging my whole attention, it is difficult to find time for correspondence with hostile journalists. Were I assailed personally, I would not deem their most violent assaults worthy of a moment's notice. But you attack my office, and through me you wage war against all Bishops, all priests, and all ministers of religion of whatsoever denomination who believe in a divine mission to teach the doctrine and law of the Saviour, to proclaim its truth and its duties "in season and out of season," especially in seasons of anti-Christian campaigning, and to stand manfully between the lambs of the fold and the devouring "wolf in sheep's clothing," whom the Pastor of pastors commands us to repel with zeal and unselfish courage, to denounce him and call the neighbors to join in pursuing him, regardless of the obloquy and insults of hirelings or poltroons. In fulfilment of this primary duty of my pastoral office, I now turn my attention to your editorial article of last Friday's issue, headed "Archbishop Cleary" — truly a right good name for mountebanks to conjure with in seasons of no-Popery campaign.

A question of fact has first of all to be settled. You quote from the CATHOLIC RECORD: "For the past eight years the *Globe* has been nursing an ugly grudge against His Grace, because of its failure in the attempt to dragoon the Archbishop into campaigning in opposition to Sir John Macdonald and the Conservatives during the Federal election of 1890." You, sir, take shabby advantage of the obvious misprint of 1890 for 1886 to solemnly argue the impossibility of "retaining a grudge for eight years on account of an event which is said to have happened four years ago." Verily your reasoning powers eclipse Aristotle. You proceed to say, "No such event ever happened; the story is the wildest kind of fiction." Now, sir, the fact which you designate "fiction" is absolutely indisputable, and the *Globe's* own pages are witness to its principal parts and circumstances.

Shortly after the Provincial victory over the *Mail*-Meredith host of no-Popery bigots on the 28th December, 1885, I had occasion to go to Trenton on a Saturday evening, and the good Catholic people of that town hastened to prepare an address, which they read to me the following day in the church after Mass. In addition to various other claims on which they based their gratitude and love and veneration for me, they were kind enough to mention my writings and discourses in defence of their natural and divine right, sustained by the constitutional charter, to give their children a Christian education. They likewise offered me special thanks for the arduous work I had recently done in Eastern Ontario, travelling around my missions in extremely inclement weather and instructing my faithful people everywhere on the divine obligation laid upon all parents and all Christian men to maintain this right against all aggressors. How well the Catholics of Eastern Ontario obeyed the law of God in this respect because publicly known on polling day. Trenton rejoiced in the Provincial triumph and offered me warmest congratulations. In reply I dealt with the sentiments they had kindly expressed to me; told them how important a part of the Christian religion is the Christian formation of the minds and hearts, the morals and manners and dispositions of youth; and concluded by exhorting them to cherish and guard, as the apple of their eye, the right to maintain their Separate schools. Not a word did I say to them on any other subject whatever. It happened that the Federal campaign was then in progress. The *Globe* undertook to give its readers a report of what had taken place in the church at Trenton. The local pastor, Rev. Edward Walsh, came to me with that journal in his hand and amazement in his eyes, and said to me, "Listen to the *Globe's* account of what occurred in our church!" Lo and behold! It was a forged address, seemingly prepared by somebody somewhere outside Trenton, and published in my name. It represented the whole burden of my reply to the Catholics of Trenton as a campaign delivery against the Conservatives, and against Sir John Macdonald in particular. That, as every one knows, was not one of the things I could quietly submit to. Campaigning is no function of my office. I have never campaigned since my advent to Canada. Politics do not enter into my business. I make no study of them: I never treat of them in the church, or in clerical conference, or any where else. I know no party under heaven but God's Church, of which I am an appointed ruler, charged with mighty responsibilities before heaven and earth. My clergy deal with me in constant and familiar relations and not one of them could tell to-day, after fourteen years of unrestrained intercourse, to which political party I would attach myself, were it necessary to give my adhesion to any. Was it not intolerably bad to invent such a speech, and give it to the public as mine, directly in contradiction of my life and character. Rev. Mr. Walsh prepared a letter of remonstrance to the *Globe*. I took it to Toronto and mailed it in the city. Hardly had I completed my brief repast, when a gentleman than whom Canada does not count one more upright, more truly honorable or more generally esteemed among her sons, called upon me, at the request of the *Globe*, to ask my consent to the suppression of Father Walsh's remonstrance, because of the harm that would be likely to result to the Liberal cause from its publication, since the people generally would infer from it that I favored the Conservative in preference to the Liberal party. In truth the remonstrance signified neither approval or disapproval of either side; but protested vigorously against the forgery of my name for campaigning purposes. Enough to say, that I insisted inexorably on its publication by the *Globe*, and to make this more sure, I had a dozen copies of it printed already, and had mailed them to various journals in the Province. Having been then requested to aid in preventing the remonstrance from being interpreted unfavorably to the Liberals, I consented to be interviewed by a *Globe* reporter on the subject. He came to me about 7:30 o'clock, p. m., just before tea hour, and I spent more than three hours in replying to his questions in accordance with the wishes of the distinguished gentleman who had interposed on behalf of the *Globe*. The reporter on his return to the *Globe* office, at 11:30 p. m., found the mutual friend there, awaiting the result of the interview; and I had to go to rest, after my day's fatigue, with cold feet and an empty stomach, all the household having retired to their bedrooms at their customary hour of sleep. The remonstrance and the interview appeared in the next day's issue of the *Globe*. I and my friends read it, and all were satisfied. This, sir, is what you have been pleased to call a "story of the wildest kind of fiction." Say, Mr. Editor, did the RECORD err in stating that you strove to "dragoon" me into campaigning in opposition to Sir John Macdonald and the Conservatives?

You declare, moreover, that you have "no grudge" against me. Excuse me for suggesting that you ought to consult your spiritual director as to the proper method of examining your conscience. You have been giving vent to your grudge in various forms throughout the past eight years. Why, Sir, you have even gone so far as to corrupt the report of a memorable debate in the Local Assembly in order to fling insult at me in the name of a Cabinet Minister, by suppressing one half, and mutilating the other half, of the sentence in which he made complimentary reference to my success in the well-known controversy with the leader of the Opposition in 1890. As the RECORD says in the article which you now criticize, "Could there be any clearer evidence of spitefulness and vindictiveness being the motive of the *Globe's* present hostility to the venerable and intrepid Archbishop than the following caption with which the editor introduces His Grace's most timely and telling revelation to the public of the *Mail's* abuse of the liberty of the press? Here it is in immensely large double leaded capitals: "MADILL AND CLEARY! "DELIVERANCES FROM TWO CLERICAL CAMPAIGNERS!" Was the RECORD much astray in branding you as "offensive," as "unjust and extremely insolent?" You printed that abominable caption in spitefulness and vindictiveness. You offered this deliberate insult to the sacred order of the episcopate in my person: for you know you cannot cast dishonor upon one of the episcopal body without dishonoring all. And this is more emphatically true when your insult is directed against me in my official capacity and by reason of my faithful discharge of the first duty of a chief pastor towards my flock. We, the divinely appointed Rulers of Christ's kingdom, cannot accept your dictation as to the time and manner of giving pastoral instruction to our people upon the law of God and the divine obligation laid upon parents and all true Christians to maintain and defend in all legitimate ways their rights to give Christian education to our little ones. "Feed My lambs" is the first and most imperative mandate of the Pastor of pastors to each of us; and neither we, nor our clergy, nor our people, will tolerate your misconduct in abusing us and holding us up to public execration because, forsooth, we choose to exhort our people to constancy in the faith and fidelity to duty without consulting you about the opportuneness or expediency of the time and manner of delivering such instructions. You think we ought to "lie low," and be mute as mice, while you are engaged in your political warfare; and you revile us as "clerical campaigners," because we guard our flock from having their minds and hearts corrupted by the wicked literature scattered amongst them during your electoral contest. You know full well that "clerical campaigners" is not a true or proper nickname to apply to the chief pastors of God's Church, or to any one of us in this Province. You might well have left that sort of slander to the *Mail*. You know that you are guilty of a wilful misrepresentation in calling my doctrinal instruction on faith and duty a "political manifesto." It did not contain one word on the subject of politics or political parties. It is the same in substance as twenty other instructions delivered by me on the same subject within the past year. Neither I, nor any of my fellow-Bishops, ever engaged in political campaigning, although we have as much right to do it as the clergymen of other denominations whom you welcome into the arena. We confine ourselves to the duties of our holy calling, and in this we are one and undivided. If my voice is heard more loudly and more frequently than that of other Bishops on this subject of the divine right and duty of parents to christianize their offspring in our schools, it is because the leader of the no-Popery faction challenged me directly to defend the sacred cause of Christian education against him, and the Bishops of the Province in full assembly expressed to me their unanimous wish that I should go to the front and meet the Philistine openly and publicly with couragous heart. They are with me, and I am with them. We are one in Christ, in office, in duty, in heart and soul. As one of them, in congratulating me ten days ago on the delivery of that pastoral instruction which you and the *Mail* agreed to designate a "political manifesto," writes: "It is worthy of you, being full and solid in doctrinal teaching, and quickened by the spirit of God's Church. May God bless you and strengthen and sustain you in all your works. *This one utterance will do for us all.* Our views are, thank God, *quid unum et idem*, and that is a great comfort and satisfaction." Don't imagine, therefore, Mr. Editor, that you can insult me in my official capacity without involving in the same insult every Bishop, every priest and every loyal Catholic layman. We will continue, with or without the permission of Your Mighty Highness, to instruct our flocks on the law of God and the duties of Christian life "in season and out of season;" and I hope to be pardoned for differing from your thoroughly Apostolic mind when I say, that a most suitable season for strengthening the faith of our flocks, and directing them in the path of duty, is when your political campaign is in progress, and the country flooded with impious literature, and the ravening wolf is rushing with terrible ferocity down upon the fold.

As to your linking of my name, or rather part of my name stripped of its official adjuncts, with that of the individual whom you call "Madill," I will not spoil its significance by any comment. Every one knows who and what that individual is, and the sublime morality of his present occupation, which he has prudently judged to be more lucrative than that of stable boy. You remind me of the universally execrated method employed in the English penitentiaries twenty years ago for superadding dishonor and moral degradation to the incarceration and other physical sufferings of the Irish political prisoners. Many of these were gentlemen by birth and education and refinement of culture. The practice was to chain each of them to some vicious, brutish, sin-hardened criminal of the worst type, to whom the sensitive Irishman, who loved his country, "not wisely, but too well," was thus bound in closest companionship at meals, at work, in the cell and in the quarry, for morning till night — Enough. Please say, was the RECORD wholly erroneous in stigmatizing you as untruthful, unjust, insolent and vindictive?

In your article of last Friday's issue you returned to your defence of Mr. Meredith, and your condemnation of me for having charged him with using "extremely bad language in relation to Catholics," and having described him as a "hungry adventurer"; and this you repeat is "language of unwarranted violence." Before dealing with this judicial delivery of years, I must ask you to explain to the public why you corrupted the text of my instruction by attributing to me the phrase "*extremely* bad language," instead of "*very* bad language," as it stands in the original. Twice in your article you have perpetrated this dishonorable trick. It looks as if corruption of the utterances, oral or written, of all who dare to disagree with you, has become quite natural to you by dint of long practice. I stand by my own words, not by your falsification of them. Whatever you may consider expedient for the little coterie of so-called Liberals who hang around you and swear by you, the real Liberal party, represented by Sir Oliver Mowat and his Cabinet, loathe your shameful methods, and their murmurings are heard on every side against your misconduct. "*Non tali auxilio, nec defensoribus istis*" shall their battle be won. They know that you are their trouble and their danger. Already you have turned their friends into enemies by the thousands; and, if they do not quickly bring you to time, you will certainly work disaster on their cause.

In reference to the charge against Mr. Meredith, that he has used "very bad language against the Catholics," I must ask you to allow me to quote the following paragraph from the same copy of the RECORD from which you have extracted the subject matter of your criticism:

"Why did he (Mr. Meredith) not attempt to show that there is no 'very bad language' in his never-ending vilification of the schools of Christian education; his charge against the Government for allowing them to be established in the Province in which the right of Catholics to establish and maintain them is guaranteed by the constitution; his futile admissions that they cannot be 'immediately' abolished and the 'Provincial' Legislature has no power to abolish them, invariably followed by an expression of regret that their existence is permitted by law, and that the constitution may and ought to be 'amended' on this point, and that this can be brought about by loud and persistent agitation on the part of his friends, the secret society men; that the Christian education of the Separate schools is inferior to that of the Public schools; that the Catholic inspectors, appointed by the State, should be dismissed, and Protestant inspectors set over the Separate schools, to manipulate them in the spirit of Mr. James L. Hughes & Co.; that the religious Sisters of Notre Dame and Loretto and St. Joseph should be expelled from all Separate schools, and Catholic children be deprived of their highly effective and most valuable training of mind and heart and character and manners; that the Catholic Readers, through which the best examples of Christian morality and domestic and social virtue and elevation of spirit above selfishness in public and private life, are impressed on the plastic minds of our little innocents, must be torn from the hands of the children and flung out of the school-house, and replaced by a set of books that will tell them nothing of God and His goodness and justice and power and mercy, and will leave their minds and memories and hearts an utter blank religiously and morally at the conclusion of their term of school life; and finally that it is 'treason' on the part of the Government to allow 'facilities' for the establishment of Separate schools and that the Liberal Government have been doing this in fulfilment of a compact with the Catholic body for repayment by a 'solid vote.' His recent reiteration compels us to include in his multiplied deliveries of 'very bad language' his most awful, and awfully wicked, call upon all the atheists, agnostics, Infidels and extreme bigots to combine in 'solid vote' against the Catholic minority of Ontario; when, after exhausting his oratory on this subject, he shouted to his mob, 'unite, unite, against the common enemy,' for 'there is 'danger to the State."

I come finally to my defence of the phrase "hungry adventurer" as applied to Mr. Meredith's successive attempts to stir up the passions of bigotry and sectarian strife in this Province of diverse races and divided religions in 1883, 1885, 1890, and now in 1894. Really, Mr. Editor, I sympathize with you in your great grief over this terrible injustice that has been done to the innocent leader of the Opposition. Allow me to entreat you to wipe away those crocodile tears that stream down your guileless cheeks. Be consoled by the assurance that the loud indignation of the *Mail* Meredith faction over this stain upon the escutcheon of their chief is all feigned for campaign purposes; it is purely a piece in the theatrical performance, the farce of the play. If the hon. leader himself was at first a little angry, because of the aptness of the pen picture drawn by me in two words, he must ere now have begun to comfort himself by the reflection that the delineation was very mild; indeed, so much so, that the English language hardly supplies a milder phrase in which to give anything like a truthful description of his persistent attempts to destroy the peace of this Province and substitute sectarian hatred and rancour and perpetual war for harmony of intercourse and good-will among men. A special solace to you, sir, should be the remembrance of your complete satisfaction of conscience in having championed both sides in the quarrel; and by an act of journalistic heroism, singular in itself and boadering on the miraculous, you published two editorial articles in one day's issue of your paper, condemning me in the first column for the use of that famous phrase, and ably defending me in your third column by a long article in proof of the exactness of those two words as descriptive of Mr. Meredith's pro-Popery, no-Popery, strife-causing, hate-nourishing evolutions. In justice to myself, whom you have assailed so recklessly and with such "unwarranted violence," I must ask you to print here a good part of your own defence of me and my appropriate miniature of the no-Popery leader:

"To Archbishop Cleary Mr. Meredith is a political leader taking advantage of an unfortunate sectarian cleavage in the Province, and ready to espouse the cause of one side or the other, as the chances of party success seem to dictate. At one time Mr. Meredith called on Roman Catholics to unite with him and resist the aggression of the Protestant majority led by Premier Mowat and told them how the rights and claims of Roman Catholics were disregarded by the Premier—how on account of their religious faith they were denied the influence in the councils of the State to which their number entitled them, and how their rights could only be secured by uniting to depose the Liberal Premier from office. It was during this campaign that the still familiar 'Facts for Irish Electors' pamphlet appeared in the Conservative interests, its purpose being to persuade Roman Catholics that they were unjustly treated by the Mowat Ministry. It is generally easy to persuade a man that he is badly used. And there is no doubt that the persistent repetition of this charge during a warm election contest won a number of Roman Catholic votes for Mr. Meredith's candidates. That line of campaigning had also the deplorable result of widening the cleavage between the two great religious divisions of the people of Ontario. But the great body of intelligent Roman Catholics saw clearly the insincerity of his appeals at that time, just as the intelligent Protestants can see through his pretences now, as he appeals to them against Roman Catholic aggression. At the next general election the fortunes of the campaign indicated that the chances of victory lay in the opposite direction. Then Mr. Meredith told the electors that the influence of the Roman Catholic Church dominated the Mowat Ministry, that the rights of Protestants were in danger and that they should unite against the common enemy. With the persistance of a patent medicine advertisement he declared that there was no hope for the situation except in turning out the Mowat Ministry and establishing the self-constituted champion of Protestantism in power. Seeing the deplorable estrangement resulting from these sectarian campaigns, seeing Mr. Meredith's willingness to take up the cudgels on either side as the prospect of victory seemed the brighter, and seeing practically nothing else in the Opposition leader's political course, one can partly understand how Archbishop Cleary came to designate him an adventurer hungry for office. On sectarian issues Mr. Meredith has certainly played the adventurer, changing from side to side as the prospect of success seemed to dictate. And no one will deny that he would take up the old 'Facts for Irish Electors' cry again to-morrow did it promise a better chance of party triumph.

My defence would be incomplete did I not touch upon the charges persistently made by the *Globe* and the *Mail* against me for the "imprudence," "indiscretion" and "inexpediency" of my doctrinal instruction to my flock in the season of political campaigning, also for that which they both concur in styling the "unwarrantable violence" of the phrase "hungry adventurer." Let me say in the outset, that I detest with all my heart the mean, dishonoring vice, to which party politicians too frequently give the name of "prudence" or "discretion" or "expediency." Let no man expect me to forfeit my character for manly frankness and ingenuous, unequivocal expression of truth and methods of action in dealing with my fellow-men in all affairs, public and private. The life of our Divine Master has been writen in the Bible for our instruction. He was not deterred by considerations of political prudence or expediency from rebuking the scribes and Pharisees of His time in language which the *Mail-Meredith-Globe* combination (recently formed for the muzzling of Christian pastors in the hour of havoc among their flocks) should consistently denounce as imprudent, indiscreet and unwarrantably violent. The scribes and Pharisees were the *elite* of society, men of high position, recognized leaders of public thought; and yet the Teacher of Truth and Pastor of Pastors publicly stigmatized them on numberless occasions as "blind guides, hypocrites, full of extortion and uncleanness, whited sepulchres, which outwardly appear to men beautiful, but within are full of all filthiness — serpents, generation of vipers," &c., &c. Of course, he was punished for His "imprudence" and "violence" by an ignominous and most cruel death. But I think it not irrelevant at this precise moment to call the attention of the *Globe* and the *Mail* to the conduct of three distinguished politicians who figured in that campaign against the innocent Son of God and the Virgin Mary. One was the President of the great National Council, called the Sanhedrin. He delivered judgment in these words: "It is expedient for you that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not." Observe the words, "It is *expedient for you*"—a remarkable instance of political expediency. The second politician was the Governor-General of Judea. He, after proclaiming the innocence of Christ, became alarmed at the loud cry of the mob, "If thou release this man, thou art not Cæsar's friend," and accordingly, to insure his own political safety, he delivered up the Holy One to the fury of the Jews. The third politician was a Provincial Governor, or Tetrarch. He helped on the campaign of the day by "mocking" Jesus and putting on Him a "white garment" to excite the derision of the populace, as He was dragged through the streets of the city. The sacred historian significantly adds, "Herod and Pilate were made friends together that same day; for before they were enemies one to another."

Look at the fruits of our Divine Master's example. His Apostles, men most timid by nature, but fortified by the Holy Ghost on Pentecostal Day, had the courage to preach Christ crucified as the Son of God and Saviour of men to the very same crowd that put their Master to death seven weeks previously. Wasn't it most imprudent, indiscreet and inexpedient? Of course they were arrested and lodged in jail. Again they preached, and again they were arrested by the police and brought before the Council, where on being commanded "not to teach in this Name;" they replied, "We ought to obey God rather than men." Then they were scourged, and the Council "charged them not to speak at all in the Name of Jesus." The Evangelist adds, "They ceased not every day, in the temple, and from house to house, to teach and preach Christ Jesus." All which would be extremely imprudent, indiscreet and inexpedient in the Province of Ontario.

Pardon me if I refer briefly to St. Paul, who doubtless is your favorite Apostle. In the first chapter of his Epistle to the Romans he boldly denounces the learned philosophers of the day in language so explicit and so awfully strong, that the passage does not bear to be printed on a popular sheet. Let one sentence suffice. "Professing themselves to be wise, they become fools, filled with all iniquity, malice, covetousness, wickedness, full of envy, contention, deceit, malignity — whisperers, detractors, hateful to God, contumelious, foolish, dissolute, without affection, without fidelity, without mercy." In the same way this Apostle of the Nations rebukes the pseudo-prophets, or false teachers, in all his Epistles, never dreading to speak the truth in denunciation of the no-Popery leaders that opposed him everywhere in his Divine mission. His maxim was, "If I wished to please men, I should not be the servant of Christ." If, as you, Mr. Editor, say, the phrase "hungry adventurer" is unwarrantably violent, what note of censure would you stamp upon St. Paul's description of the Cretans. "They are always liars, evil beasts, slothful bellies." Or upon the reply of St. John the Evangelist to a certain apostate preacher, who, meeting him in the streets of Rome, asked, "Don't you know me?" got for answer, "Yes, I know you to be the eldest son of the devil." And this was the Apostle of extraordinary meekness and charity for all men. As for the description given by the Apostle St. Jude of the false teachers who sought to deceive the Christian people, in his time, by their slanders and impieties, I forbear to ask you to print it. It would be too shocking to the pious ears of the *Mail-Meredith-Globe* combination, who consider it altogether wrong for the Chief Pastors of God's Church to go forth and meet the ravening, rushing wolf at the fence of the sheepfold otherwise than in "bated breath and whispering humbleness" and bows and salutations of marked respect for the polished beauty of his teeth and the cheering music of the midnight howl.

I remain, sir,
Your most submissive and trembling liegeman,
+JAMES VINCENT CLEARY,
Archbishop of Kingston.

The Catholics of Algoma.

Algoma, June 11, 1894.

A numerous and influential meeting of the Catholics of Algoma was held on the 9th inst. to discuss the P. P. A. G. Fitzgerald, Esq., was elected Chairman and John Tansey was requested to act as Secretary. The object of the meeting was explained by Medard Framont in the French language and by John Tansey in English. The following preambles and resolutions were passed unanimously:

1. Whereas, it appears, from the printed ritual of the P.P.A., that it is an association the object of which is to do all the harm it can to the Roman Catholic Church and its members individually;

2. And, whereas, its members solemnly swear to use their utmost endeavors to exclude all Roman Catholics from any office in the gift of the people and from all political offices in the government of this Province;

3. And, whereas, such conduct is contrary to the teaching of Christ, who enjoins on us unchristian;

4. And, whereas, as such course of action tends to deprive the country of the services of able and trustworthy public officers;

5. And, whereas, Catholics, as a body, have in the history of this country shown themselves fair and disinterested in the treatment of their fellow-Christians of other forms of belief;

Therefore, the following resolutions were unanimously passed:

1. Moved by John Tansey, seconded by F. D. Pepin, that the principles and action of the P. P. A. are both unchristian and unpatriotic and deserving of the condemnation of all upright and honorable men.

2. Moved by Medard Framon, seconded by Edward Ryan, that Catholics have ever been ready in defence of this country and in upholding of lawfully established government.

3. Moved by James Jones, seconded by Paul Cote, that all loyal subjects of Her Gracious Majesty the Queen are entitled to treatment on terms of perfect equality in matters affecting their civil and religious rights and liberties.

4. Moved by Alphonse Metivier, seconded by Theodore Routhier, that all aiders and abettors of the P. P. A. are unworthy of the continuance and support of Catholics.

5. Moved by Oliver Lenville, seconded by Piere Bardeleau, that, in the exercise of our franchise, we will refuse our votes to candidates for legislative honors who do not distinctly and unreservedly disown and repudiate all sympathy with that association known as the P. P. A.; and we also heartily agree with the CATHOLIC RECORD, *Northwest Review*, *La Verite*, of Quebec, Toronto *Globe* and other liberal-minded newspapers of this country in the noble stand they have taken in exposing that secret society known as the P. P. A.

The following gentlemen were appointed to act as a committee in forwarding the minutes of this meeting to the press for publication: Garrett Fitzgerald, John Tansey, Frank D. Pepin.

A RETREAT FOR LADIES

Will be given at the Convent of the Sacred Heart, Queen's avenue, commencing Monday evening, June 25, and closing Friday, June 29.

For Cards of Invitation, and further particulars, apply to the Lady Superior.

THE MAIL-MEREDITH-P. P. A. TRINITY.

To the Editor of the CATHOLIC RECORD:

Sir—The surprising hypocrisy of the Toronto "Mail" was never exhibited in a better light than in an editorial which appeared in its issue of the 14th inst., under the caption "The Cry of Intolerence." It says no such issue as the toleration of Roman Catholics is before the people in this contest at all; that the real question is, whether special privileges should be extended to the hierarchy commanding the "crystallized vote." Further on in the same article we are told that "it is misleading to declare that toleration is at all at issue, for no rights are threatened, and no interference with the religion of any person is suggested, or even honestly feared." The editor of the journal in which the above appeared must have unbounded confidence in the gullibility of his readers or he would hardly have the hardihood to assert "that no rights are threatened," and that "no interference with the religion of any person is suggested." He knows that those statements are absolutely false and misleading; he knows that the P. P. A. is not a benevolent society organized to protect Catholic interests, but one whose members are sworn to proscribe, in public and in private life, the professors of this religion; he knows that the Conservative campaign heelers and their P. P. A. allies are circulating in Protestant localities a vile production called the "Eye Opener," in which, among other things equally offensive to Catholics, it is stated that "there is no burning issue in Canada to-day except this: shall the Pope rule Canada?" and that "Civil society cannot but consider Roman Catholics either as aliens and not entitled to office, or else as traitors." Yet the "Mail" newspaper has the effrontery to tell its readers that no interference with any man's religion is suggested, and that no intolerance or appeals to religious prejudice is used in this campaign by the supporters of the cause it advocates. That there are appeals to sectarian prejudices no person will honestly deny, and a good deal of it is due to the efforts of the "Mail" itself. It is not quite so violent or offensive in its language as some of the other P. P. A organs, but its venom is none the less deadly by being partly obscured under an array of fine words and grandiloquent expressions.

A grand opportunity was afforded the "Mail" Meredith P. P. A. triumvirate to appeal to the religious prejudices of their Protestant friends by parading before the public some expressions used by His Grace Archbishop Cleary of Kingston, in that famous manifesto which forms the burden of every political speech delivered by the leader of the Opposition since the opening of this campaign. By dint of continued twisting and torturing the word "requires" the "Mail" succeeded in proving that His Grace's sole object in writing and publishing his manifesto, was to compel the Roman Catholics under his spiritual jurisdiction to unite in upholding the Mowat Government; and at every meeting at which Mr. Meredith spoke since, he failed not to make all the political capital out of it that he possibly could by denouncing Archbishop Cleary and proclaiming his own tolerant and liberal attitude towards the Catholics of this Province. Actions speak louder than words. Whenever the opportunity occurs he shows what he means by toleration and liberality. He showed it by bringing forward a measure, in the early part of the last session, to hamper and render as impracticable as possible the working of the Separate School Law; and when his Bill was defeated he and his followers, almost to a man, voted for the P. P. A. Bill fathered by Mr. McCallum. We have only to point to the fact that in some thirty constituencies his candidates are supported by the P. P. A., and, worse than that, a large number of them are members of this vile association. Now let me ask the "Mail" what amount of justice can Catholics reasonably expect from a Government controlled by such Catholic-hating thugs as the members of this infamous and un-Christian society. Let every Catholic elector in the Province ask himself this question before the 26th inst., and if he finds it his duty to vote for a Meredith P. P. A. candidate he is sadly lacking in a proper amount of common sense. What if Mr. Meredith himself is tolerant in his views: he is controlled by the society above referred to; he draws a large measure of support from its members, and, besides, he permits the diffusion of anti Catholic literature in places where it will have the most effect in turning the tide in his favor. It sounds well from a platform, and it looks well in print, to proclaim justice and equality, irrespective of creed or nationality, but he is in bad company, and as long as he remains there he is not entitled to the support of any right-thinking man, be he Protestant or Catholic. His is a case of running with the hare and hunting with the hounds.

Yours etc.,
June 16, 1894. ANTI-P. P. A.

ARCHDIOCESE OF TORONTO.

Archbishop Walsh at Barrie.

On Sunday, 10th inst., His Grace Archbishop Walsh administered the sacrament of confirmation to eighty-five candidate in St. Mary's church, Barrie.

His Grace was assisted by Dean Egan, Father Ryan of St. Michael's cathedral, and Father Gibra.

After the ceremony, and an appropriate address to the children, His Grace preached a powerful sermon on the Institution and Indestructability of the Church of Christ.

In the afternoon Father Ryan gave an address to the League of the Sacred Heart, congratulating the society on its flourishing condition in Barrie.

In the evening at Vespers Father Ryan delivered a most eloquent sermon in aid of the funds of the society of St. Vincent de Paul in the parish.

On Monday morning the Archbishop, accompanied by Father Ryan, left for Toronto.

COMMENDATORY.

South Norwich, County Oxford,
June 16, 1894.

Thomas Coffey Esq., — Dear Sir: — Enclosed you will find payment in advance for three subscriptions to the CATHOLIC RECORD.

We are all delighted in this neighborhood with the noble stand the RECORD has taken in sounding the clarion to summon Catholics to defend their rights and institutions at this critical moment when they are attacked by Mr. Meredith and his allies, whether known as P. P. A's, McCarthyites or Equal Righters. This last name is especially a misnomer, for the real object of all these combinations is the domination of fanatics and persecution of Catholics.

Yours truly,
WILLIAM MCNAMARA.

PICNIC IN AID OF THE ORPHANS.

A grand picnic in aid of the orphans and aged poor of Mount Hope Orphan Asylum, London, will be held on the beautiful and shady grounds of that institution on Dominion Day (July 2). The committee offer unsurpassed attractions in the way of sports, games, etc., and have taken exceptional care to provide perfect accommodation for a large gathering. All who attend will spend a most enjoyable afternoon and evening, and, besides, will have the satisfaction of knowing that the money they spend will be devoted to a praiseworthy undertaking—the maintenance of the aged poor and the little orphans.

LETTER FROM MR. BRICK.

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN THE SEPERATE SCHOOLS.

To the Editor of the Kingston Daily News:

Sir,—Your editorial under the heading of Separate Schools, in Saturday's issue, contains statements so flagrantly at variance with the truth, that I feel it my duty, in justice to my fellow-citizens, both Protestant and Catholics, to acquaint them with the facts as they really are, in those schools, so far as I can speak from experience and observation. With the political issues, I shall not concern myself.

You ask, "Do the Separate schools of today carry out the original scheme which contemplated a system of schools in all respects a reflex of the Public school system, the only difference being in the half hour or so of religious exercises, with which the school day usually begins?" In the several Public and Separate schools in which I have taught, and so far as my observation of others has extended, the original scheme is carried out to the letter. The same subjects are taught in both schools, the same methods of teaching employed, and, "barring the religious teature during the first half-hour," in every respect are the schools similar.

But, "The exercises during the first half-hour consist largely of instruction and drilling in the Church Catechism." The catechism contains a summary of the Christian doctrines; in brief, the Christian's duty to God, his neighbor and himself. It is true, the teachers spend some time in explaining and teaching these duties. Will anyone calling himself a Christian, say that this is wrong? Have we not the almost unanimous verdict of thinking Protestants of to-day, that the Public schools have been found wanting? Even the most ardent advocates of that system admit that the results expected have not been realized. Is not the problem of "How can religious instruction be given in the Public schools?" pressing itself forward for a solution at almost every ministerial conference? Even the worthy editor of the *News*, not many months ago announced himself a convert to the view that religious instruction should be given in the Public schools. Why, then, does he object now? Lo, the "Church Catechism" is taught in the Separate schools. There is the rub. It is not that religious instruction is wrong, but "drilling in the Church Catechism" should not be tolerated.

The "Church Catechism," you continue, "contains statements calculated to produce ill feeling between the two sections of the community — such as, that Luther was a detestable wretch, who lived and died in an infamous manner; and that Protestants are on the high road to hell." Now, what are the facts? The authorized Catechism for this Province is Dr. Butler's. Neither in it nor in any other book used in the Separate schools, is there a single statement calculated to "produce ill-feeling between the two sections of the community."

Our duty is thus summed up in the Catechism: "My neighbor is mankind of every description, and without any exception of person, even those who injure us or differ from us in religion," and "Never to injure him by word or deed in his person, property or character; to wish well to him, to pray for him, and always to assist him as far as you are able in his spiritual and corporal necessities." Luther's name is not once mentioned, nor is reference made to him, either directly or indirectly. The Catechism can be obtained at any bookstore in the city, and your readers may satisfy themselves as to the truth of my assertions.

This brings me to your next statement. Any Separate school pupil of ordinary intelligence could have told you that in his school he is taught how to work out his own salvation, not to form rash and uncharitable judgments regarding the destination of others; that God alone can read the heart and discern the motives of men's actions; and that persons not culpably ignorant of the truth may belong to the spirit of the Church, and hence may be in the way of salvation, although not in communion with her body.

You say, further, "They (the Readers) contain extracts which some people regard as calculated to instil into the minds of Roman Catholic children the principles of out-and-out Fenianism." In support of such a grave charge, it would surely have been more honorable to have specified the extracts from which "some people" draw their conclusions. I have given the Readers a most careful examination, and I challenge anyone to point to a single statement that can be interpreted as incalculating any other sentiments towards our country than those of patriotism and obedience to her laws, and towards our Sovereign and British institutions any other than those of love and respect.

The duties of Catholics towards the Civ