

The Catholic Record.

Published weekly at 41 and 43 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

REV. GEORGE E. NORTGRAVE, Author of "Missions of Modern India."

REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY, THOMAS COFFEY.

Author of "Missions of Modern India," "Missions of Modern India," "Missions of Modern India."

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

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

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

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., Sept. 6th, 1890.

THE RACE CRY RAISED AGAIN.

The Toronto Mail of 28th August is very indignant with the Government of Quebec because out of 4926 educational institutions which receive an appropriation from Government, only 1010 are Protestant, whereas 3916 are Catholic.

Of these there are 3779 Catholic, and 939 Protestant primary schools. Among the latter, there are 770 in which French is not taught. There are also 68 Catholic schools in which French is not taught.

When it is considered that the Protestants form less than 14 per cent. of the population of Quebec, it will not appear very liberal on the part of the Catholic majority that nearly 20 per cent. of the subsidized primary schools of the Province are Protestant, and nearly 35 per cent. of the schools for higher education.

In Ontario, the Catholics form nearly 17 per cent. of the population, but the number of Catholic primary schools to which a small Government grant is given is only 239, being little more than 4 per cent. of the primary schools.

In other words, the liberal school laws of Quebec furnish the Protestants with a primary school for every 200 persons, while under the Ontario laws only one Catholic school is established for 1342 Catholics; or if we allow 20 per cent. for the increase of population in both Provinces, we shall have one school for 240 Protestants in Quebec, as against one school for 1610 Catholics in Ontario.

It is surely difficult to find in these figures a proof that the Protestants of Quebec are unfairly treated in school matters. The Mail is an adept at inventing grievances.

But in these figures the Mail discovers yet another grievance. It will be remarked that in 538 schools French is not taught. There has been no agitation whatsoever in Quebec to exclude English from the schools, and much less to force English speaking children to learn their lessons in a language they do not understand.

The Mail tells its thought on the subject in this evasive style: "It will be time enough to answer L'Estandart's question with regard to the question of intolerance when the purpose of the Government in asking for the information is disclosed. It would not be surprising to learn that it is proposed to take steps to compel the seven hundred and seventy Protestant schools to teach French."

It is needless to say that the Quebec Government has given no indication that it has any such intention as the Mail presumes. Yet, it might be asked, where would be the great hardship if steps were taken to have French taught in the English schools of Quebec? No one complains that English is the chief language of the schools in Ontario; why, then, should it be considered a hardship if in Quebec the study of French were more strongly encouraged? Let us not forget that Mr. Craig's Bill, introduced into the Ontario Legislature and supported by Mr. Meredith and the Mail, sets forth that "English shall be the language of every Public and Separate school in this Province," and that "no teacher shall be employed or permitted to teach in any Public or Separate school in this Province unless he be capable of speaking the English language and of conducting the proceedings of his school according to the programme of studies applicable thereto in that language."

Mr. Craig's tyrannical bill proposed further, under severe penalties, that not more than one hour daily should French

be permitted to be taught temporarily in any French locality. It is not becoming the Mail or other supporters of Mr. Craig's proposals should complain if similar provisions were really proposed to be enacted by the Legislature of Quebec; but we have no reason to think that such tyranny is intended. The census of 1881 shows that Quebec has a larger percentage of population of French origin than Ontario has of English, Irish and Scotch combined.

French-Canadians are 79 per cent. of the population of Quebec, whereas these English-speaking nationalities comprise only 71 per cent. of the population of Ontario. It is rather too presumptuous, therefore, for the English-speaking part of the Ontario population to claim any rights over the minority here, which they hesitate to acknowledge in the French part of the population of Quebec.

We are, of course, aware of the pretext with which the would-be ascendancy party in Ontario are accustomed to meet all arguments in favor of the equality of rights of our French-Canadian fellow-citizens. They are fond of making a distinction between the vanquished and the victors. But the history of Canada does not justify such a distinction. The treaties which assured to French-Canadians their rights as British subjects make no distinction between citizens of British and of French origin.

They stand upon a footing of perfect equality, and on this footing they must stand, if the Dominion is to be preserved. Several generations have passed away since Canada was ceded to Great Britain; and surely, if even to the French inhabitants of the country Great Britain was willing in the eighteenth century to grant the full rights of British subjects, those rights cannot be taken from their descendants who were born under the British flag, and who have, whenever it was necessary, defended that flag at the sacrifice of their lives and property. There is no cry more menacing to the welfare of the country than the war-cry of those who cause irritation and dissension by proclaiming the ascendancy of one fraction of the population over the rest. Such ascendancy cannot and will not be endured. The bogus Equal Rights may make up their minds to this.

A QUANDARY.

The Rev. Mr. McQueary, of Ohio, who, not long ago, astounded the clergy and laity of his denomination, the Protestant Episcopal, by denying, in a public declaration of his belief, the Resurrection of Christ and the virginity of His mother, maintains still his position in the Church, though the Episcopalian press call upon him to withdraw, and there appears to be no means of compelling his resignation of his position, which, he declares, he intends to hold. He asserts in a new letter recently published that the formulas of the Church are not infallible, and that, therefore, he is not bound to believe in them, and that the sixth article of religion gives him liberty to maintain his private judgment on doctrine. The sixth article is:

"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary for salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."

He points out that the Bishop of New York stated in his letter of 28th June that "some day the Church may choose to restate and redefine her views of our Lord's birth and resurrection," and he very pertinently asks:

"But how, I would earnestly ask, can she ever be prepared for such a reconstruction of her formulas if all free discussion thereof be crushed by the odium theologium or ecclesiastical anathema? At any rate, we who hold the above opinions claim that they must be disproved ere we can resign our ministerial commissions; but this being done, I for one am quite ready to go where Protestant infallibility is not asserted, and where I may be allowed to speak occasionally according to the dictates of my God-given conscience and reason."

He considers that the sixth article of the Church's creed, as above quoted, is like an amendment by which the rest of the creed is to be judged, just as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States is interpretative of other previously existing articles of the Constitution. The Church acknowledges that her articles are not infallible, but that they contain the views as to what uninspired theologians considered to be true. He infers that the sixth article "appeals from the Church's dogmas to Holy Scripture, and gives to every clergyman the right to interpret Scripture by facts and reasons, and to offer such alterations in those dogmas as may seem to him necessary, and when he does offer such amendments no one has any more right to excommunicate him than Congress has to unseat a member for proposing an amendment to the Constitution."

It is difficult to see how the Church authorities, proclaiming, as they have always done, private judgment as the supreme and ultimate rule by which faith is to be tested, can deal with Mr. McQueary. He ought not to be excommunicated or suspended, as long as he

adheres to this principle by which alone Protestants of all shades defend their own secession from the Church; yet, it is a very ludicrous position to have a clergyman in full communion who declares dogmas which are acknowledged to be fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion.

Only recently another clergyman of the Church proposed to form a united Christian Church by admitting to communion not only all who believe in God in any form, but even those who doubt or deny His existence. It is the present tendency of Protestantism to seek for union on just such lines as these, and we hear a great deal of talk about the Christian charity with which the sects should overlook differences in dogma in order that such a union may be effected. One evidence that such is the tendency is to be found in a work on union issued by the Very Rev. James Carmichael, Dean of Montreal, which, though not formally recognized by the Anglican Church, nevertheless has been tacitly accepted, by the very fact that a clergyman in his position should have been, and would have been, reproved if he thus publicly taught doctrines which were believed to be contrary to the recognized standards of his Church. The Dean says in reference to one of the objectionable articles of Presbyterian faith, speaking of the contingency that a union may be effected:

"That there must be an article on the subject seems a necessity, but it might be so framed as, on the one hand, to acknowledge the sovereignty of God, and, on the other, to allow the exercise of the right of private judgment as to how God uses that sovereignty for His own glory and the good of His Church."

This is plainly an acknowledgment that the Churches must be prepared to compromise important doctrines in order to effect a union. If this course can be tolerated, why should the negotiations for Christian unity be limited to a few sects? Why should not the aim be to extend it to denominations which differ still more widely than do Anglicans, Presbyterians and Methodists?

That the Anglicans are not alone in their readiness to compromise doctrine is evident from the discussions which have taken place on the revision of the Westminster Confession. We have Dr. Dewitt, who opposed revision, stating: "The Westminster Divines left the whole subject (the salvation of all or of the few elect infants) to individual opinion, and made places under the Confession—as our fathers, by adopting their work made places in the Church—for men of widely differing views." In the same letter, which is an answer to Dr. Vanduyke, a pro-revisionist, Dr. Dewitt, thinks that Dr. Vanduyke is sufficiently refuted when he shows that the Confession is "less narrow" than the latter would make it. The Presbytery of New Brunswick put forward similar reasons for adhering to the Confession, because of its "moderate, Catholic and irenic character." In conclusion the same Presbytery adds:

"In the interests of Church union, therefore, as in the interests of a broad and irenic, moderate and Catholic Calvinism, we deprecate any changes in our historical standards, to the system of doctrine contained in which we unshakably adhere, and with the forms of statement of which, we find ourselves in hearty accord."

son be learned, we believe the country will not suffer thereby. At all events it is a free country, and the Catholic Church is not inclined to discontinue her good works merely because bigots and fanatics rail against her and belier her. As was to be expected the Jesuits come in on this occasion for a share in the Mail's misrepresentations. It argues that, because the works of the Jesuits and other religious have been unjustly impeded and prohibited by recent decrees of the new Government of Brazil, therefore they should not be tolerated in Canada. The Mail does not exactly say this in plain words in the article under consideration, but this is the burden of its complaint, and it has frequently said this plainly in other articles during the last few years. But the Ontario fanatics were told by Lord Stanley that there is no evidence that they have been engaged in conspiracies or other evil works that would justify their expulsion just now, and we were loudly assured by the discomfited deputation that they were not surprised at the cool reception given them by His Excellency. It may well be surmised that the absence of surprise arose from the consciousness that their foul slanders were not worthy of credit. Dr. Carman and others raged at the answer they received, but in spite of all the Jesuits will continue their work of education, as well as their missionary labors, which have been so fruitful in good in Quebec and in Ontario as well.

It is unnecessary to follow the Mail through its innuendoes that the Jesuits are using for evil the moneys which came to them from "the good round sum received from the State." They are putting that "good round sum" to good use, and the people who compose the State will be all the better educated because it has fallen into the Jesuits' hands. At all events they were entitled to the money, and it is no business of the Mail and the other malcontents to what use they may apply it.

The Mail repeats the malicious falsehood that the Jesuits are detested by a large body of the Catholic priesthood of Canada. There is no foundation for such a statement. It is on a par with the statement which was furnished to the press during the anti-Jesuit crusade, and which, if we remember right, was vouched for in the Mail by its "own correspondent," that the Bishop of Three Rivers had suspended the Jesuits from exercising the sacred ministry in his diocese, because they had unlawfully influenced dying people to make wills for their benefit. This calumny was contradicted over the signature of Mgr. Lefebvre, who stated that he had never entertained even the thought of suspending the Jesuits, and that it had never come to his knowledge that "the Jesuit Fathers had influenced any person of his death-bed to change his will in their favor."

We do not say that the Mail's hatred of the Jesuits comes from the fear that it will be heavily fined for having libeled them, for the calumnies of the Mail against that highly revered body preceded the entering of the libel suit of "Jesuits vs. the Mail," which is still pending before the courts. But we presume that journal would like to have a clear field to abuse the Jesuits, in order that it might secure the support of the rabble who are never pleased with any reading less malodorous than that which it furnishes to nauses.

As to the matter of expelling religious orders from Canada we can assure our contemporary that the Catholics of the Dominion will have a word to say in the matter, and it will find some difficulty in discovering where those Catholics are, clerical or lay, who, as it pretends to think, will join with it in the cry for their expulsion. The Mail has professed before now great horror for the "solid Catholic vote." It may discover something like that very rarest of men when the attempt will be made to expel Jesuits, or any other religious order, from Canada.

If the Jesuits were plotting to drive the English language out of the Dominion, to prevent Protestant children from being educated, to control the legislation of Ontario from Quebec in all financial matters—there might be some reason for the Protestant press of Ontario to denounce them; but it so happens that the Jesuits are doing nothing of the kind. It is the Protestant Ministerial Associations, the Synods, Conferences, and Presbyteries, that have been endeavoring to inflict these injustices upon the Catholics. If there is a body of clergy in the country at all who ought to be denounced for aggressiveness, let the Mail look for them in the associations we have named. But as to the Catholic religious orders, the noblest fruits of Catholic doctrine, they will continue to multiply in Canada and the United States as long as the Catholic Church shall be able to preserve her liberty of action, which she is not likely soon to lose.

Imitation is the highest homage of admiration which can be paid to an institution, and when we find the Protestants of to-day imitating the religious orders of the Catholic Church, through they have been for three hundred years the object of

son be learned, we believe the country will not suffer thereby. At all events it is a free country, and the Catholic Church is not inclined to discontinue her good works merely because bigots and fanatics rail against her and belier her. As was to be expected the Jesuits come in on this occasion for a share in the Mail's misrepresentations. It argues that, because the works of the Jesuits and other religious have been unjustly impeded and prohibited by recent decrees of the new Government of Brazil, therefore they should not be tolerated in Canada. The Mail does not exactly say this in plain words in the article under consideration, but this is the burden of its complaint, and it has frequently said this plainly in other articles during the last few years. But the Ontario fanatics were told by Lord Stanley that there is no evidence that they have been engaged in conspiracies or other evil works that would justify their expulsion just now, and we were loudly assured by the discomfited deputation that they were not surprised at the cool reception given them by His Excellency. It may well be surmised that the absence of surprise arose from the consciousness that their foul slanders were not worthy of credit. Dr. Carman and others raged at the answer they received, but in spite of all the Jesuits will continue their work of education, as well as their missionary labors, which have been so fruitful in good in Quebec and in Ontario as well.

It is unnecessary to follow the Mail through its innuendoes that the Jesuits are using for evil the moneys which came to them from "the good round sum received from the State." They are putting that "good round sum" to good use, and the people who compose the State will be all the better educated because it has fallen into the Jesuits' hands. At all events they were entitled to the money, and it is no business of the Mail and the other malcontents to what use they may apply it.

The Mail repeats the malicious falsehood that the Jesuits are detested by a large body of the Catholic priesthood of Canada. There is no foundation for such a statement. It is on a par with the statement which was furnished to the press during the anti-Jesuit crusade, and which, if we remember right, was vouched for in the Mail by its "own correspondent," that the Bishop of Three Rivers had suspended the Jesuits from exercising the sacred ministry in his diocese, because they had unlawfully influenced dying people to make wills for their benefit. This calumny was contradicted over the signature of Mgr. Lefebvre, who stated that he had never entertained even the thought of suspending the Jesuits, and that it had never come to his knowledge that "the Jesuit Fathers had influenced any person of his death-bed to change his will in their favor."

We do not say that the Mail's hatred of the Jesuits comes from the fear that it will be heavily fined for having libeled them, for the calumnies of the Mail against that highly revered body preceded the entering of the libel suit of "Jesuits vs. the Mail," which is still pending before the courts. But we presume that journal would like to have a clear field to abuse the Jesuits, in order that it might secure the support of the rabble who are never pleased with any reading less malodorous than that which it furnishes to nauses.

As to the matter of expelling religious orders from Canada we can assure our contemporary that the Catholics of the Dominion will have a word to say in the matter, and it will find some difficulty in discovering where those Catholics are, clerical or lay, who, as it pretends to think, will join with it in the cry for their expulsion. The Mail has professed before now great horror for the "solid Catholic vote." It may discover something like that very rarest of men when the attempt will be made to expel Jesuits, or any other religious order, from Canada.

If the Jesuits were plotting to drive the English language out of the Dominion, to prevent Protestant children from being educated, to control the legislation of Ontario from Quebec in all financial matters—there might be some reason for the Protestant press of Ontario to denounce them; but it so happens that the Jesuits are doing nothing of the kind. It is the Protestant Ministerial Associations, the Synods, Conferences, and Presbyteries, that have been endeavoring to inflict these injustices upon the Catholics. If there is a body of clergy in the country at all who ought to be denounced for aggressiveness, let the Mail look for them in the associations we have named. But as to the Catholic religious orders, the noblest fruits of Catholic doctrine, they will continue to multiply in Canada and the United States as long as the Catholic Church shall be able to preserve her liberty of action, which she is not likely soon to lose.

Imitation is the highest homage of admiration which can be paid to an institution, and when we find the Protestants of to-day imitating the religious orders of the Catholic Church, through they have been for three hundred years the object of

son be learned, we believe the country will not suffer thereby. At all events it is a free country, and the Catholic Church is not inclined to discontinue her good works merely because bigots and fanatics rail against her and belier her. As was to be expected the Jesuits come in on this occasion for a share in the Mail's misrepresentations. It argues that, because the works of the Jesuits and other religious have been unjustly impeded and prohibited by recent decrees of the new Government of Brazil, therefore they should not be tolerated in Canada. The Mail does not exactly say this in plain words in the article under consideration, but this is the burden of its complaint, and it has frequently said this plainly in other articles during the last few years. But the Ontario fanatics were told by Lord Stanley that there is no evidence that they have been engaged in conspiracies or other evil works that would justify their expulsion just now, and we were loudly assured by the discomfited deputation that they were not surprised at the cool reception given them by His Excellency. It may well be surmised that the absence of surprise arose from the consciousness that their foul slanders were not worthy of credit. Dr. Carman and others raged at the answer they received, but in spite of all the Jesuits will continue their work of education, as well as their missionary labors, which have been so fruitful in good in Quebec and in Ontario as well.

It is unnecessary to follow the Mail through its innuendoes that the Jesuits are using for evil the moneys which came to them from "the good round sum received from the State." They are putting that "good round sum" to good use, and the people who compose the State will be all the better educated because it has fallen into the Jesuits' hands. At all events they were entitled to the money, and it is no business of the Mail and the other malcontents to what use they may apply it.

The Mail repeats the malicious falsehood that the Jesuits are detested by a large body of the Catholic priesthood of Canada. There is no foundation for such a statement. It is on a par with the statement which was furnished to the press during the anti-Jesuit crusade, and which, if we remember right, was vouched for in the Mail by its "own correspondent," that the Bishop of Three Rivers had suspended the Jesuits from exercising the sacred ministry in his diocese, because they had unlawfully influenced dying people to make wills for their benefit. This calumny was contradicted over the signature of Mgr. Lefebvre, who stated that he had never entertained even the thought of suspending the Jesuits, and that it had never come to his knowledge that "the Jesuit Fathers had influenced any person of his death-bed to change his will in their favor."

RELIGIOUS ORDERS.

The Mail of the 27th ult. contained an article on the multiplication of religious orders in Quebec and Ontario, the object of which is to alarm Protestants in view of the progress of the Catholic Church in the Dominion. It forgot to add, however, that there is also an increase of so-called religious orders among Protestants of the Provinces, and especially among those of Ontario. There has been for many years a Protestant Sisterhood in Toronto, and recently a similar Sisterhood has been established in Hamilton. The City Council of Hamilton have now before them an offer from a Church of England Sisterhood to take charge of the poor and infirm on payment of a sum equal to that which they have been paying hitherto for the care of these classes, and we are informed that, whether or not the Council accede to the petition, the religious order will go on with its work all the same. We are also assured that the Methodist and Presbyterian intend to institute orders of "deaconesses" to assist in the work of their ministry. As the Mail assures us that the religious orders are "taking possession of the land," and "accomplishing the undertakings of Rome," it ought not to neglect warning its followers of the danger which will ensue from the multiplication of these Protestant orders, which are also "certainly possessing the land, and accomplishing the undertakings" of their spiritual guides.

But it will be said that these orders are instituted for merely charitable purposes, and that it would be iniquitous to interrupt their good works. For what other purpose, then, unless for works of charity and benevolence are the Catholic religious orders established? The Trappists are one of the orders recently introduced at Oka. The Mail itself says, "The Trappists are not an aggressive order." It adds that they are "vigorous religionists," and it pretends to describe their life, which it acknowledges to be a life of self-sacrifice, religious exercises and penance, the purpose of which is simply to save their souls.

Truly in this age when people are so engrossed in worldly matters as to think of nothing but the almighty dollar, it is instructive to the world to see a body of men, doing their own labor, receding from desolation lands which need irrefragable energy and toil to render them productive, and yet finding time to devote to the saving of their souls, obeying the precept of our Lord, "Seek first the kingdom of God and His justice; and all these things (food, clothing and other earthly needs) shall be added unto you." (St. Matt. vi, 33)

The Trappist life is a life of separation from the outside world. It is embraced chiefly by persons whose aim is their own sanctification, which they endeavor to assure to themselves by laborious works, such as tilling the ground and exercising various trades, and by prayer; the priests of the order, however, attend to the spiritual needs of Catholics in the missions where they are established. This they do at their home in Gethsemane, and at Tracadie, Nova Scotia. This life can surely injure in no way the timid Protestants over whom the Mail has enough influence to make them believe that they are living on the vitals of the country.

The Franciscans, of whom the Mail also speaks, and who have started a house in Montreal, devote themselves to missionary work, and to the care of the poor. Their zeal, and the success of their work in distant lands, may be judged from one spot in Palestine, which they inherit from their founder, St. Francis, and which they have held since A. D. 1219. Here they have succeeded in implanting the faith of Christ so firmly that though there have been over two thousand Franciscan martyrs to Mahometan hate against Christ they have extended their missionary labors throughout Syria, and all Asia Minor, Armenia, Thracia, the Isle of Cyprus and Egypt. They attend the sick in the capacity of physicians, and distribute medicine to the poor, gratis, without distinction of nationality and religion. The poor are also taught there, without cost, whatever trades they desire to learn; printing, type making, book binding, carpentry, masonry, blacksmithing, tailoring, shoemaking, baking—in fact almost anything in the line of human industry. They have, besides, sixty-eight churches and chapels, twenty-eight parishes, forty-two schools for boys and girls, besides a college, several orphan asylums and hospitals. The introduction of such an order into Canada will certainly do no injury to the country.

But will it not inflict some injury on Protestantism? Well, the good example shown by these holy and devoted priests may teach some of those Protestants who have been educated in ignorance of the ways of the Catholic Church that such journals as the Mail, and such preachers as Dr. Wild, and other vilifiers of Catholic religious orders, are calumniators of the worst stamp, and the lesson may not give them much confidence in their teachers of the past, but if this les-

son be learned, we believe the country will not suffer thereby. At all events it is a free country, and the Catholic Church is not inclined to discontinue her good works merely because bigots and fanatics rail against her and belier her. As was to be expected the Jesuits come in on this occasion for a share in the Mail's misrepresentations. It argues that, because the works of the Jesuits and other religious have been unjustly impeded and prohibited by recent decrees of the new Government of Brazil, therefore they should not be tolerated in Canada. The Mail does not exactly say this in plain words in the article under consideration, but this is the burden of its complaint, and it has frequently said this plainly in other articles during the last few years. But the Ontario fanatics were told by Lord Stanley that there is no evidence that they have been engaged in conspiracies or other evil works that would justify their expulsion just now, and we were loudly assured by the discomfited deputation that they were not surprised at the cool reception given them by His Excellency. It may well be surmised that the absence of surprise arose from the consciousness that their foul slanders were not worthy of credit. Dr. Carman and others raged at the answer they received, but in spite of all the Jesuits will continue their work of education, as well as their missionary labors, which have been so fruitful in good in Quebec and in Ontario as well.

It is unnecessary to follow the Mail through its innuendoes that the Jesuits are using for evil the moneys which came to them from "the good round sum received from the State." They are putting that "good round sum" to good use, and the people who compose the State will be all the better educated because it has fallen into the Jesuits' hands. At all events they were entitled to the money, and it is no business of the Mail and the other malcontents to what use they may apply it.

The Mail repeats the malicious falsehood that the Jesuits are detested by a large body of the Catholic priesthood of Canada. There is no foundation for such a statement. It is on a par with the statement which was furnished to the press during the anti-Jesuit crusade, and which, if we remember right, was vouched for in the Mail by its "own correspondent," that the Bishop of Three Rivers had suspended the Jesuits from exercising the sacred ministry in his diocese, because they had unlawfully influenced dying people to make wills for their benefit. This calumny was contradicted over the signature of Mgr. Lefebvre, who stated that he had never entertained even the thought of suspending the Jesuits, and that it had never come to his knowledge that "the Jesuit Fathers had influenced any person of his death-bed to change his will in their favor."

We do not say that the Mail's hatred of the Jesuits comes from the fear that it will be heavily fined for having libeled them, for the calumnies of the Mail against that highly revered body preceded the entering of the libel suit of "Jesuits vs. the Mail," which is still pending before the courts. But we presume that journal would like to have a clear field to abuse the Jesuits, in order that it might secure the support of the rabble who are never pleased with any reading less malodorous than that which it furnishes to nauses.

As to the matter of expelling religious orders from Canada we can assure our contemporary that the Catholics of the Dominion will have a word to say in the matter, and it will find some difficulty in discovering where those Catholics are, clerical or lay, who, as it pretends to think, will join with it in the cry for their expulsion. The Mail has professed before now great horror for the "solid Catholic vote." It may discover something like that very rarest of men when the attempt will be made to expel Jesuits, or any other religious order, from Canada.

If the Jesuits were plotting to drive the English language out of the Dominion, to prevent Protestant children from being educated, to control the legislation of Ontario from Quebec in all financial matters—there might be some reason for the Protestant press of Ontario to denounce them; but it so happens that the Jesuits are doing nothing of the kind. It is the Protestant Ministerial Associations, the Synods, Conferences, and Presbyteries, that have been endeavoring to inflict these injustices upon the Catholics. If there is a body of clergy in the country at all who ought to be denounced for aggressiveness, let the Mail look for them in the associations we have named. But as to the Catholic religious orders, the noblest fruits of Catholic doctrine, they will continue to multiply in Canada and the United States as long as the Catholic Church shall be able to preserve her liberty of action, which she is not likely soon to lose.

Imitation is the highest homage of admiration which can be paid to an institution, and when we find the Protestants of to-day imitating the religious orders of the Catholic Church, through they have been for three hundred years the object of

son be learned, we believe the country will not suffer thereby. At all events it is a free country, and the Catholic Church is not inclined to discontinue her good works merely because bigots and fanatics rail against her and belier her. As was to be expected the Jesuits come in on this occasion for a share in the Mail's misrepresentations. It argues that, because the works of the Jesuits and other religious have been unjustly impeded and prohibited by recent decrees of the new Government of Brazil, therefore they should not be tolerated in Canada. The Mail does not exactly say this in plain words in the article under consideration, but this is the burden of its complaint, and it has frequently said this plainly in other articles during the last few years. But the Ontario fanatics were told by Lord Stanley that there is no evidence that they have been engaged in conspiracies or other evil works that would justify their expulsion just now, and we were loudly assured by the discomfited deputation that they were not surprised at the cool reception given them by His Excellency. It may well be surmised that the absence of surprise arose from the consciousness that their foul slanders were not worthy of credit. Dr. Carman and others raged at the answer they received, but in spite of all the Jesuits will continue their work of education, as well as their missionary labors, which have been so fruitful in good in Quebec and in Ontario as well.

It is unnecessary to follow the Mail through its innuendoes that the Jesuits are using for evil the moneys which came to them from "the good round sum received from the State." They are putting that "good round sum" to good use, and the people who compose the State will be all the better educated because it has fallen into the Jesuits' hands. At all events they were entitled to the money, and it is no business of the Mail and the other malcontents to what use they may apply it.

The Mail repeats the malicious falsehood that the Jesuits are detested by a large body of the Catholic priesthood of Canada. There is no foundation for such a statement. It is on a par with the statement which was furnished to the press during the anti-Jesuit crusade, and which, if we remember right, was vouched for in the Mail by its "own correspondent," that the Bishop of Three Rivers had suspended the Jesuits from exercising the sacred ministry in his diocese, because they had unlawfully influenced dying people to make wills for their benefit. This calumny was contradicted over the signature of Mgr. Lefebvre, who stated that he had never entertained even the thought of suspending the Jesuits, and that it had never come to his knowledge that "the Jesuit Fathers had influenced any person of his death-bed to change his will in their favor."

We do not say that the Mail's hatred of the Jesuits comes from the fear that it will be heavily fined for having libeled them, for the calumnies of the Mail against that highly revered body preceded the entering of the libel suit of "Jesuits vs. the Mail," which is still pending before the courts. But we presume that journal would like to have a clear field to abuse the Jesuits, in order that it might secure the support of the rabble who are never pleased with any reading less malodorous than that which it furnishes to nauses.

As to the matter of expelling religious orders from Canada we can assure our contemporary that the Catholics of the Dominion will have a word to say in the matter, and it will find some difficulty in discovering where those Catholics are, clerical or lay, who, as it pretends to think, will join with it in the cry for their expulsion. The Mail has professed before now great horror for the "solid Catholic vote." It may discover something like that very rarest of men when the attempt will be made to expel Jesuits, or any other religious order, from Canada.

If the Jesuits were plotting to drive the English language out of the Dominion, to prevent Protestant children from being educated, to control the legislation of Ontario from Quebec in all financial matters—there might be some reason for the Protestant press of Ontario to denounce them; but it so happens that the Jesuits are doing nothing of the kind. It is the Protestant Ministerial Associations, the Synods, Conferences, and Presbyteries, that have been endeavoring to inflict these injustices upon the Catholics. If there is a body of clergy in the country at all who ought to be denounced for aggressiveness, let the Mail look for them in the associations we have named. But as to the Catholic religious orders, the noblest fruits of Catholic doctrine, they will continue to multiply in Canada and the United States as long as the Catholic Church shall be able to preserve her liberty of action, which she is not likely soon to lose.

Imitation is the highest homage of admiration which can be paid to an institution, and when we find the Protestants of to-day imitating the religious orders of the Catholic Church, through they have been for three hundred years the object of

unmeasured abuse, it is a testimony to the zeal of the religious orders and to their efficiency in the work which it is their purpose to accomplish.

THE NATIVITY OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN.

In the feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, which the Church celebrates on the 8th day of September, there is this feature worthy of remark, that the day of the birth of the saints is not the day on which their feasts are usually celebrated. The day of their death, being the occasion of their admission to the happiness of heaven, is regarded as their feast, because this is their birth to glory, when they receive their everlasting reward; and even the day of their death is wont to be called their natal day. On this subject Eusebius Emisenus says:

"For if we call those days natal days (birthdays) when we are born to the light of earth in sin and sorrow and for sorrow, more justly will those natal days be celebrated on which the saints enter into the new clearness of the future life, from bodily corruption, on which the children of men ascend to the adoption of their divine Father."

Besides the feast of the Nativity of Blessed Virgin, the Church celebrates only the Nativity of our Lord, and that of St. John the Baptist. On the 25th of December our Blessed Saviour begins His life on earth, whereby the work of His redemption is to be accomplished. This is reason enough why we should give that day to rejoicing and thanksgiving. The nativity of St. John the Baptist is celebrated in fulfillment of the prophecy of the Angel, who proclaimed before he was born, "many shall rejoice in his nativity." (St. Luke i, 14)

But to this reason it may be added that the Church celebrates this feast because St. John the Baptist, though not conceived immaculate, was sanctified before birth, in accordance with the declaration of the same angel:

"He shall be filled with the Holy Ghost even from his mother's womb."

In the case of the Blessed Virgin, conceived immaculate, and truly sanctified our mother, by our Blessed Lord when, stretched on the cross, He committed His beloved Apostle to her care as to a mother, we have even more reason to celebrate her nativity.

In the time of St. Augustine the feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin was not yet instituted, or at least not celebrated by the whole Church, for that illustrious Doctor asserts that only the birthdays of Christ and St. John the Baptist were then kept as festivals. In the ecclesiastical office of the day there is a sermon of St. Augustine quoted in which occur the words: "Let the earth rejoice, being rendered glorious by the natal festivity of so great a Virgin." But the word natal is simply an ecclesiastical application of the sermon to that special feast, solemn being the actual word used by St. Augustine. Florentinus states that the sermon was preached on the feast of the Annunciation.

The festival certainly existed in the seventh century, for it was spoken of by St. Idefonsus, who lived in that century; and there are a special Mass and appropriate prayers for it in the Roman and Gregorian Sacramentaries, which undoubtedly existed long before St. Idefonsus. The solemnity is also kept by the Greeks on the same day with the Catholic Church, so that it must have been established in the Church long before the Greek schism. It was, however, at first kept on another day, and was changed to September the 8th.

The Holy Scripture does not give the names of the Blessed Virgin's parents, but there is strong historical and patristic testimony which shows that they were St. Joseph and St. Anne.

The feast of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin was established by the Church in order to have us put confidence in her power of intercession with her divine Son, and that by meditation on her sanctity and prerogatives, we may imitate her virtues and become worthy to attain the eternal joys of heaven.