

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE H. NORTHGRAVE,
Editor.

REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY,
Business Manager.

REV. LEO KING JOHN NICH,
Printer.

Advertisements—Ten cents per line each insertion.

Approved by the Bishop of London, and recommended by the Archbishops of St. Boniface and Ottawa, and the Bishops of Hamilton, Kingston, 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 a change of address should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

very glad to get their children admitted to the Catholic schools, because the latter are in many cases superior to the public schools, even in towns so important as Lindsay. Such cases frequently occur, but the Catholic trustees and teachers do not think it necessary to proclaim them to the whole world, and it is only when bigots of the Sam Hughes stamp cause the circumstances to become known that public attention is drawn to them. We may further remark that in such cases the Catholic schools do not get either the Legislative school grant or the taxes to which the school would be entitled in justice on account of the attendance of such pupils. The Mail has been making great complaint about the injustice inflicted once in a while by the accidental placing on the separate school roll of Catholic parents who send their children to public schools, or who desire to do so. If it were so much the advocate of equal rights as it pretends to be, it would find a fit subject for indignation in the fact that separate schools are always deprived of the taxes of Protestant parents and of the Legislative grant also, when Protestants send their children by choice to the separate schools.

THE ROMAN QUESTION.

In connection with the constant repetition of rumors that the Pope is about to leave Rome, the Cincinnati Wahrheitsfreund calls attention to the following expression of Frederic IV. wherein that monarch clearly implies that, in spite of prognostications to the contrary, Rome will continue to be the city of the Pope. The Wahrheitsfreund says:

"Frederick IV. of Prussia once declared: 'Forty-four times have the Popes been driven from Rome, but nevertheless all who have occupied it to the disadvantage of the Papacy, have left it again, and the Popes have returned thither.'"

The Protestant press are very fond of prophesying that the Holy Father is on the point of leaving the city, and that when he will leave it again the Catholic Church itself will soon cease to exist. But it is certain that the Pope has no intention of leaving permanently, and if such were his intention the Catholic world itself would for the protection of religion take steps for his restoration. There have been occasions when, to escape persecution and invasion, Popes have been obliged to leave Rome temporarily, but their absence has been in every case only temporary. The bandits who are now annoying Leo XIII. may be able to continue their evil work for a time, under protection of the present anti-Catholic Government, but the Catholic spirit of Italy must in the end triumph, and the Pope's authority will then be established on a firmer basis than ever. The Catholic powers will also in the end insist upon a proper position being given to His Holiness that he may be able to exercise a proper independence in his government of the universal Church. It is indeed possible that circumstances may necessitate the removal of Pope Leo for a time, and the infamous law of Crispi, which will go into force in September, will make it really dangerous for the Pope to fulfil his duties. But the latest intelligence is that the power of Crispi is on the eve of being shattered. Both Austria and Prussia are of opinion that the opposition of the people to Crispi's whole policy will cause the fall of his Government within a few weeks, and at the present moment the triple alliance is severely threatened, though a few days ago it seemed to be a fixed fact. Austrian and German papers are stating freely that, under the circumstances which have recently developed themselves, these two countries must take steps to secure themselves against Russia's aggressions, independently of Italy, which cannot be relied on in an emergency. Thus Signor Crispi's strongest reliance is suddenly taken from him. In the meantime, it is expected that a new Government must step in soon, and this will undoubtedly be the beginning of a new policy toward the Holy See. There is little room to doubt, the new policy adopted will be one of conciliation.

OBITUARY.

The death is announced of two illustrious ecclesiastics of the United States whose services to religion have been great and enduring. The first is that of Right Rev. Bishop Machefontaine, of Denver, Col., who first devoted himself as a priest to the spiritual care of the Catholic people of North Western Ohio in 1840 when the people were few and scattered over a large area. Much of his time was then necessarily spent in the saddle while he journeyed over the vast area over which his flock was spread. By degrees he witnessed its development in numbers and material prosperity. He afterwards removed to New Mexico in 1851, under Bishop Lamy. In 1868 he was appointed Vicar-Apostolic of Colorado, and while under his care that State has grown and prospered until now churches and religious institutions are multiplied through every quarter. In 1887 he became first Bishop of Denver. Two years ago the Right Rev. Bishop Matz was appointed his coadjutor, with right of succession, so that now Bishop Matz assumes the position created by the death of his predecessor.

In the diocese of Denver, which was once attended by the late bishop, as the sole missionary priest, there are now sixty-two priests and about one hundred and seventy nuns of various orders, forty-eight churches, a college and ten academies, besides twenty-one parochial schools with five thousand pupils attending. The Catholics in the diocese are estimated at about forty-two thousand.

The other death is that of Mgr. James A. Corcoran, editor of the American Catholic Quarterly Review, and one of the staff of the Seminary of St. Charles. Dr. Corcoran had a world wide reputation as one of the most distinguished scholars of the Catholic Church in America. By his death the Church loses one of its ablest defenders. He was remarkable both for his theological learning and his amiability of character. Not only the Quarterly Review but the thousands of Catholics who read that periodical with interest will feel the loss deeply. May they rest in peace.

DR. DEWART'S EXCELLENT SPEECH.

A considerable number of the members of the Press Association made an excursion to the maritime Provinces spending a very pleasant time. They were everywhere well treated, and nowhere was there a more cordial reception given them than in Quebec. Under the guidance of their Quebec brethren they went on a trip around the harbor and to the shrine of "La Bonne Ste. Anne."

We are informed that Rev. Dr. Dewart, the outgoing President of the association, manifested great interest in the multitude of crutches and other evidences of the miraculous cures which have taken place at the shrine.

Most of our readers are aware that Rev. Dr. Dewart is the able editor of the Christian Guardian, the organ of the Methodist Church in Canada, and on the return of the excursionists to Quebec on the 30th ult., he was appointed to address the Quebec members of the association and to thank them for the cordial reception of the excursionists. The reverend doctor made it a point to condemn most emphatically the efforts which are now being made by evil-minded persons to excite strife between British and French Canadians, as injurious to the best interests of our common country. We are glad to notice this evidence of the liberal sentiments entertained by the learned editor of the Guardian. If there were more of the Protestant clergy of Ontario of his mind we would not have to deplore the threatened severance of the tie which now binds the provinces of Ontario and Quebec together, a tie which, in spite of all that the Mail and other non-Popery journals have said on the subject, has been most beneficial to both. French-Canadians have, undoubtedly, made some sharp retorts on those who have been endeavoring to create discord, but the provocation has come from Ontonians, and though Dr. Dewart does not explicitly state this, he plainly enough implies it in his speech.

The doctor states that this very trip had opened his eyes to the good qualities of the French-Canadians and had taught him that they have a kindly feeling for the people of Ontario. He declares that his contact with them has had the effect of making him more liberal-minded towards them. We are especially pleased to find such sentiments uttered by a Protestant clergyman, and since the mollifying effect of a visit to Lower Canada is so great, we cannot but utter the hope that more of the ministers of Ontario will make similar visits. We fear, however, that the liberality of Dr. Dewart will be as unacceptable to his brethren who assisted at the bogus "Equal Rights" Convention, as were those of Dr. Hertridge to his colleagues of the Presbytery of Ontario.

We may have, and we have in Canada, differences of religion, language and race which must be borne, whatever the form of our Government, and true patriotism should teach toleration to all. The problem of the Dominion is not how we are to force our sectional theories upon each other, but how we can labor together to build the Dominion up into a great and prosperous country. Dr. Dewart very properly deprecates the creation of distinct parties on the basis of religious differences, as Protestant and Catholic, and in this we are of one accord with him.

It is but fair to state here that one or two French-Canadian journals have expressed their opinion that the Press excursionists were lionized too much. It was said that among them there were some of the most implacable enemies of Lower Canada, and that Lower Canadians should have borne this in mind on the occasion of their visit. It cannot be denied that there is a good deal of truth in the remark; however the friendly and forgiving spirit of the French-Canadians is all the more evident on this account; for the fact of the cordial reception cannot be blotted out by the protest of one or two journals. We presume that even in Ontario there sometimes is found a difference of opinion between journalists, and the circumstances that this is the

case should make us all tolerant of differences of opinion among journalists in another Province. The general feeling was probably better voiced in the cordiality of the reception than in the protest, and we hope that this fact will tend to increase friendship between members of the press in both provinces.

Another matter seems to have given offence in some quarters, but any feeling of chagrin is not justified by the circumstances. A Te Deum was sung at the Church of Ste. Anne on the occasion of the visit, and Cardinal Taschereau, on hearing of the fact, strongly condemned the act. Members of the press will readily understand that their excursion was not an adequate reason for a special religious demonstration, which is permitted by the Church only on the most solemn occasions when God's great bounty to mankind has been manifested in an extraordinary manner. It was, therefore, eminently proper that His Eminence should blame those who were at fault in making that religious demonstration for an insufficient cause.

We publish Dr. Dewart's speech as it appeared in the Empire, which journal calls it "a capital speech." The Mail had always been careful, up to the delivery of the doctor's speech, to report the progress of the Press excursionists, but the day of the delivery of the speech has been entirely ignored by that journal. The Mail seems to be quite unaware that any such speech was delivered. Sir Adolphe Caron's excellent speech at Lundy's Lane the Mail could afford to publish, because Sir Adolphe is a French-Canadian, and that journal could abuse him. But Dr. Dewart is an Ontonarian, a Torontonian, too, and one of the most respectable among the Methodist clergy of the Province. It was easier, therefore, to pass him by than to deal with him as it dealt with Sir Adolphe. The doctor spoke as follows:

"All the Ontario press excursionists have now left town for their homes. The reception in their honor and the trip down the river, though marked by no remarkable features, were quite successful and apparently much appreciated by the visitors. The event of the day was the speech of Rev. Dr. Dewart on behalf of the Ontario press, the reverend gentleman making it a point to condemn in scathing language the religious and national crusade upon which some of the Toronto papers have entered. Among other things he said: 'Quebec had what very few places in Canada possessed, interesting historical recollections. Here was perpetuated in the monuments commemorating the last great struggle for sovereignty in Canada, the memory of the union of the two great races which peopled the country. He did not see that any feeling need be aroused here by a reference to the English conquest of Canada, any more than it would be called forth in England by an allusion to the conquest of that country by William of Normandy and his French followers. Nowadays if an Englishman wished to place himself above his fellow countrymen it was the custom to boast that his ancestors came over from France with William the Conqueror. If the Norman conquest had resulted in the weaving of French laws and civilization into English life, so the result of the cession of Canada to the British Crown had been a propitious circumstance in many respects for the people of this country. It was to be expected that he would refer to recent events and agitations, but he would say that ignorance was, no doubt, the parent of prejudice. Since his pleasant visit with the Press Association of Quebec, to Chicoutimi, the Saguenay, the Grand Ettrale and other parts of the Province of Quebec, he had certainly learnt more of his French-Canadian fellow-countrymen, and knowing them better he had learned to be more liberal-minded towards them. Then again he desired to acknowledge his appreciation of the fact that the people of Quebec had desired to show that above the din of battle, or through the smoke that seemed like that of battle, their hearts beat kindly towards them. He deprecated the attempts to set up national or religious dividing lines in Canada, and declared that the efforts to build up a Protestant party or a Catholic party, a French party or an English party, were the curse of the country. He dwelt upon the blessings of British connection and of the loyalty of the French-Canadians to that condition of affairs, adding that even if anything should ever occur in the providence of God to bring about a severance of those relations, he did not believe with those who thought that there was no other alternative for Canada but annexation. He believed, on the contrary, that we possessed the resources and material for the building up of a great, a prosperous and a self-reliant nation."

The Portuguese who fired a shot at Dom Pedro on the night of July 16th, while the latter was leaving the theatre at Rio Janeiro, is named Adrian Valde. He declares that he was instigated to make the attempt by a Republican association. Concerning this attempt a New York paper says:

"Dom Pedro, Emperor of Brazil, has been almost an ideal monarch, placing himself at the head of the national movement in favor of gradual emancipation, taking an important part in international alliances for the suppression of the slave trade, opening the great rivers of his dominions to the commerce of the world, introducing railways, telegraphs, postal routes and public schools, and establishing a new era of material prosperity for his people. In every other quarter of the world the Portuguese have been governed badly, but in Brazil the Alcantaras have pursued an enlightened policy and given form and direction to the agencies of modern civilization. Such a sovereign as Dom Pedro II. does not deserve to fall by the hands of a mob."

THE CATHOLIC VOTE.

An article which appears in the Mail of 29th ult. under the title "the Catholic vote" can only be characterized as a most despicable attempt to throw dirt at the whole Catholic body, from the highest ecclesiastical functionaries to the laity of every degree. It is hard to conceive that such an article should have been written by any one having the least respect for his own character or for the intelligence of his readers. It is not our intention to attempt to disprove by any serious argument what so outrages common sense, for it is one of the first principles of logic that what is asserted without evidence may be denied without evidence.

We must apologize to our readers for bringing the subject to their attention at all, but our apology is that we wish them to know the virulence with which the Mail treats all subjects connected with the Catholic Church. The bitterness with which one of the Mail editors has long treated everything that savors either of Irish nationality or Catholicity is well known; and from him little else could be expected but malignity and misrepresentation; but from his erratic views he has long been regarded as a mere failure in any attempt to direct public opinion. To his views regarding current events no reasonable person pays the least attention, notwithstanding his acknowledged literary ability. From his colleague in the editorial chair something better might be expected, for he at least has some knowledge of the religion he once professed and practiced, and well he knows that his theory about the Catholic vote being for sale for a corrupt bid is beneath contempt. The Mail says:

"The Liberal party got the Catholic vote by a corrupt arrangement with Archbishop Lynch and the Catholic League in 1871, and have held it corruptly ever since, for the Catholic Church is not Liberal but reactionary."

It is perfectly true that at the local election of 1886 there was a fairly solid vote cast by the Catholics of Ontario in favor of Mr. Mowat's administration, but the reason for this is apparent on the surface. It is not necessary to look for a corrupt bargain and sale to account for it. An effort was then made by the Mail in its capacity as the Conservative organ, to defeat Mr. Mowat by raising a non-Popery cry, and that cry was echoed from one end of the Province to the other chiefly by Conservative candidates. It was threatened to destroy the Catholic school system, which is a system perfectly in accord with the best interests of the Province. It is to the interests of Ontario as well as of the Catholic Church that the rising generation should have a moral training, and such a training is best imparted in religious schools. The Catholics, therefore, by insisting upon the liberty of giving religious instruction to their children, voted in accordance with their conscientious convictions as to parental rights and liberties, and at the same time for the best interests of their country and creed; and they did not need that either the non-existing league or the revered Archbishop of Toronto should sell their solid vote. They had sufficient instinctive knowledge themselves to vote against any party which might threaten their liberties, and this is the secret of the tolerably solid vote given by them at the election referred to.

But let us turn to the other side of the account. Let us suppose for a moment that the Catholic vote was handed over to Mr. Mowat by the clergy, would that be any worse than the effort which the Methodists have made in Quebec only a few days ago to coerce Mr. Merxier's government by instructing the Methodist representative on the Protestant Council of Instruction to vote against the acceptance of the \$600,000 which has been apportioned by the Legislature for Protestant education, simply because a proportionate sum has been devoted to the same time to Catholic education? The Methodists are evidently not satisfied with a proportionate sum. They want one third, which is what they usually get, instead of one seventh, which would be their proper share.

Turn next to Ontario. Do we not find the Anglican Synod, the Methodist Conference, the Presbyteries the Ministerial Associations, united with one accord in endeavoring to influence the Dominion Government to interfere with the legislation of another Province, and do we not find them threatening the same Government with the terrors of a solid Protestant vote unless they yield to such clerical demands? Do not

these parsons with almost one voice laud the thirteen who voted non-confidence in the Government for not submitting to Protestant clerical domination? With much more justice, then, might we say that the Protestant vote has been sold at a corrupt bargain to Mr. Dalton Bisset McCarthy. There was no such agitation raised by Archbishop Lynch as the Protestant clergy have excited within the last few months, and the Mail's assertions, which are reiterated day after day, have not a particle of truth in them. But if any party, we care not by what name it may be called, third party or otherwise, raise the non-Popery banner, it may expect that the Catholics will be on the opposite side. In ranging ourselves so, we shall be exercising our rights as free men and as British subjects, and it will be no easy matter to suppress us either. At St. John's Mr. McCarthy threatened us with bullets for the settlement of the questions which are now before the public. Be it remembered that out of every thousand inhabitants of the Dominion, there are 426 Catholics. The other 574 include Protestants of every shade, Jews, Mormons, Atheists and Nothingarians. It is not always easy for 574 men to annihilate 426, even if the larger number were united on one side. But Mr. McCarthy should bear in mind Esop's story of the Cat and the Fox. Reynard said "Let things turn out ever so bad, he did not care, for he had a thousand tricks for them yet, before they should hurt him." Puss said: "Nay: I have but one shift for it, and if that won't do I am undone." When the hounds came suddenly on them, the cat by help of her single shift ran up a tree, while Reynard with his thousand tricks was overtaken on the plain and torn to pieces by the dogs.

Be it remembered that the organ of the non-Popery party acknowledged the other day that Quebec stands on a vantage ground. In the first place it is not to be expected that the Protestants of Quebec will join in a senseless non-Popery crusade against their neighbors, who have always manifested towards them the greatest liberality, and there are even in Ontario, thousands of liberal Protestants who have no sympathy with the fanatics. We know that Orangemen are and that Orangemen generally would willingly employ their bullets for the suppression of the Catholic Church. They used them freely enough in the days that are past. But even among Orangemen there are many who are disgusted with the intolerance that body has displayed, and the thousands of tolerant Ontonarians will have no part in Mr. McCarthy's display of bullets. Yet should even that display prove stronger than we believe it can be, the Mail itself has acknowledged that there is still a shift left which would be decisive of which we might avail ourselves, even though we would adopt it only as a last resort.

The fact is we are ready for the battle with the ballot. We have no fear of the result should Mr. McCarthy and his myrmidons have recourse to the bullet, when they find themselves beaten at the polls.

The whole story of the Mail about the sale of the Catholic vote is a fabrication of the editorial staff of that journal. The Catholics will, as usual, vote according to their consciences, as Protestants do, some on one side, some on the other, unless, indeed, they be forced by the fanaticism of a strong party, to unite in self defence. This is an event which is not likely to occur again. Fanaticism did not prove a success in the hands of an able man like George Brown. It is less likely to prove so in the hands of the incapables who are now endeavoring to foster it.

GENERAL BOULANGER'S DEFEAT.

The last session of the French Chamber of Deputies passed a law abolishing the scrutin de liste, so that now each division elects its own deputy, instead of voting for the deputies of the whole arrondissement. A law was also passed that no person shall be candidate for more than one district, the object of this being to prevent Gen. Boulanger from being elected in numerous divisions, and thus exhibiting his popularity throughout the country. Both laws were, indeed, intended to lessen the General's influence, but it was overlooked that on Sunday, 25th ult., there were elections for Councils General in 115 constituencies, and that with succeeding Sundays 257 elections will hold similar elections. The General determined at once to open his campaign against the Government, and as the law against multiple candidacy does not apply to these elections, he contested 80 cantons on Sunday, as it would serve as an index of popular will, and would have a great effect on the general elections which were expected to come off in October.

The result, however, did not justify the General's anticipations, as he gained only 12 of the 80 elections which he expected to win easily. The Government are jubilant over this result, and it is said that they will now bring about the elections in August instead of October, as they have every prospect of succeeding all over the country.

LORD STANLEY'S REPLY—THE PREACHERS REBUKED.

The ministers of Presbyterian and Methodist churches, with a few lay fanatics and several old women of both sexes, who petitioned Lord Stanley to dissolve the Jesuits' Estate Act, were, on last Friday, gravely rebuked by His Excellency for their insane bigotry and sent home to Ontario with a large-sized flea in their ears. Rev. Dr. Caven for Ontario and Leo H. Davidson for Quebec headed the petitioners. It is said the delegates were politely, if not warmly, received by the Governor General. Among the petitioners were our own enlightened and liberal-minded Mayor and the Rev. W. H. W. Boyle, of the White Cross League, St. Thomas. Rev. Dr. Caven was the first speaker. "The Act," he said (which allowed the Jesuit Fathers some compensation for all their confiscated property), "bestows money for denominational purposes and endows a society whose standing and history make it utterly unfit to become a public beneficiary." It has been told again and again, in both weekly and daily papers of this Province, that Dr. Caven had received from the Ontario Government land in Algoma valued at \$150,000 for denominational purposes—that is for the use and benefit of the Knox College of Toronto of which he is Principal—and how Rev. Dr. Caven could have the cheek to use "denominational grants" as an argument against the Act surpasses all understanding. We do not object to Government donations of colleges or educational establishments of any Christian denomination; but all should be treated alike, as the charitable institutions of the country are treated by the legislature. The amount of good done and of work accomplished is the basis of grants to denominational institutions of every character; but when done for one should be done for all. As the Knox College in Toronto has been endowed and enriched by public grants above all others, it becomes Dr. Caven to put forward the argument that because the Quebec Government bestowed a certain sum of money for denominational purposes therefore its Act should be vetoed by the Governor General; especially when what was done for the Jesuits was done for all—for the Laval University, for the other colleges, the Protestant schools getting their share, \$80,000. The next powerful objection brought forward against the Act was that "the standing and history of the Jesuit Society make it utterly unfit to become a public beneficiary." This argument had very little weight with a man of Lord Stanley's literary and historical attainments. His Excellency was educated in the schools of diplomacy—where both sides of every question must be seen and examined, and where societies with grand, world-known records are not viewed with the cramped, one-sided squinting of Presbyterian exclusiveness. His Excellency had read other books than the Provincial Letters of Pascal, which, Voltaire said, were not serious but merely designed to raise a good laugh at the expense of the Fathers. Lord Stanley had read some more impartial and reliable account of the Jesuits than appears in the work of Fra Paolo Sarpi, who was a rebel against all authority and was excommunicated by Pope Paul V. His Excellency did not come out here to Canada to be schooled by Professor Caven, and learn from him who and what are the Jesuits, therefore he said, in rebuke to the entire deputation of preachers and fanatics:

"Let us be fair-minded and sane in our judgment and not hurried away by prejudices. I cannot find that in this nineteenth century the Society of Jesus has been less loyal or less law abiding citizens than others. The legal status of the society was settled by the Act of Incorporation of 1857, and the Jesuits' Estate Act has left their rights as it found them. I venture with all due deference, gentlemen, to you to maintain that a vote in Parliament is not a thing to be made little of. The House of Commons represents the Canadian people. Let me urge respectfully all possible toleration for the opinions and convictions of every class of our citizens, any hope that the Act will be disallowed, and I cannot conceal the danger I apprehend that the Governor General might be made by the concurrence of such a deputation as yours, a court of appeal as I were against constitutional powers. Let me repeat it again: I cannot hold out to you the slightest hope that the Jesuits' Estate Act will be barred from becoming law."

The papers say that the delegates were wild with indignation. No doubt the were wild when they got from the higher authority in the realm so severe a slap in the face. And now if they do not submit with a good grace and take to heart and put in practice the lessons of toleration and history taught them by Her Majesty's representative—if still they continue to fret and fume and agitate the Province and threaten to smash Confederation all good citizens must hold them guilty of disrespect and rebellion to the supremacy of the Queen, and condemn their acts as menacing the civil and religious liberties of Her Majesty's subjects in this Dominion.