

AUGUST 11, 1894.

where. The boast that there are even twenty-seven members who have endorsed or accepted the P. P. A. platform, he declares to be "all bosh," and he lets out the secret that notwithstanding that the four Conservative members for Toronto received the endorsement of the society, one of them "refused to subscribe to the platform, although some of the leaders class him as a P. P. A. man. This is a story or a crumb of comfort thrown out by the managers who so badly bungled the election to let themselves down easily; but it will not go down with those who know differently."

The P. P. A. must have been in a great strait to have ordered its members, under penalty of expulsion, to support such a candidate, and the executive must be badly off for evidences of victory when they count such a case within the number of their gains.

The irate correspondent of the Mail is quite well aware of the alliance which existed between Mr. Meredith's party and the P. P. A.; but he is not satisfied with the total rout of nearly all the straight P. P. A. candidates, who took care to run only in those constituencies where the no-Popery card was thought to be a sure guarantee of success. He says:

"All of Mr. Meredith's supporters have always supported the general principles of the P. P. A.; but as to the special platform, there are no twenty-seven pledged to it; and the Grand Secretary or his sleeping partner cannot name them."

As the outcome we are further told that "the rank and file in Toronto are not at all satisfied with the result, and there is general talk of secession or reorganization. We do not feel like supporting an association for the purpose of providing a good fat office for an incompetent grand secretary, or giving a political pull to a few gentlemen to serve their own political ends. Let us have a complete reorganization, if the present managers have not the good sense to step down and out."

Assuredly with the P. P. A. candidates beaten in South Brant, East Durham, South Essex, North Grey, East and West Hamilton, South Lanark, North Middlesex, Monk, North Norfolk, North Oxford, Peel, West and Centre Simcoe, and North Waterloo, and only two elected on the straight P. P. A. ticket, the boasted victories of this so-called new party appear ludicrous; and the rank and file have good reason to complain of the present management. Yet we doubt very much if any management of such an association would have fared better at the hands of the Ontario electorate. There is too much good sense among the people of Ontario to return to the rule of a secret organization which reminds us of the family compact which was overthrown by them nearly half a century ago. A society whose members are ashamed of their own principles, and afraid to acknowledge in public their own membership, can never gain the ascendancy among an educated people.

The people of the province are too intelligent to be influenced by such a campaign sheet of lies as was issued by the unholy alliance under the name of "the eye-opener," and under any management the party issuing it could only expect to disgust the public instead of gaining popular support.

It is a well-known political trick for a defeated party to pretend they have gained a "moral victory;" but the extent of this moral victory may be estimated from the fact that all the aid given by the new party to their Conservative allies only brought to the combination about the same number of members in the new Legislature as the Conservatives would have had without them. We are, indeed, convinced that, without their new allies, the Conservatives would have been much more successful than they were with their help, and we believe the Conservative leaders are now fully convinced that such is the case. It looks very like it when we find it proclaimed that in the event that the Hon. J. M. Gibson and Mr. J. T. Middleton be unseated for Hamilton, two straight Conservatives will oppose them, instead of the Church by Rev. Father Constantine, C. P. The new convert had studied the works of his distinguished uncle; but the prayers and example of his believing wife disarmed his prejudices, led him to investigate the claims of the Church, and he was finally won over to the faith."

Says the *Ace Maria*: "A private letter from Buenos Ayres informs us that a nephew of Professor Huxley has been received in the Church by Rev. Father Constantine, C. P. The new convert had studied the works of his distinguished uncle; but the prayers and example of his believing wife disarmed his prejudices, led him to investigate the claims of the Church, and he was finally won over to the faith."

By Mr. Meredith's supporters have always supported the general principles of the P. P. A.; but as to the special platform, there are no twenty-seven pledged to it; and the Grand Secretary or his sleeping partner cannot name them."

As the outcome we are further told that "the rank and file in Toronto are not at all satisfied with the result, and there is general talk of secession or reorganization. We do not feel like supporting an association for the purpose of providing a good fat office for an incompetent grand secretary, or giving a political pull to a few gentlemen to serve their own political ends. Let us have a complete reorganization, if the present managers have not the good sense to step down and out."

Assuredly with the P. P. A. candidates beaten in South Brant, East Durham, South Essex, North Grey, East and West Hamilton, South Lanark, North Middlesex, Monk, North Norfolk, North Oxford, Peel, West and Centre Simcoe, and North Waterloo, and only two elected on the straight P. P. A. ticket, the boasted victories of this so-called new party appear ludicrous; and the rank and file have good reason to complain of the present management. Yet we doubt very much if any management of such an association would have fared better at the hands of the Ontario electorate. There is too much good sense among the people of Ontario to return to the rule of a secret organization which reminds us of the family compact which was overthrown by them nearly half a century ago. A society whose members are ashamed of their own principles, and afraid to acknowledge in public their own membership, can never gain the ascendancy among an educated people.

The people of the province are too intelligent to be influenced by such a campaign sheet of lies as was issued by the unholy alliance under the name of "the eye-opener," and under any management the party issuing it could only expect to disgust the public instead of gaining popular support.

It is a well-known political trick for a defeated party to pretend they have gained a "moral victory;" but the extent of this moral victory may be estimated from the fact that all the aid given by the new party to their Conservative allies only brought to the combination about the same number of members in the new Legislature as the Conservatives would have had without them. We are, indeed, convinced that, without their new allies, the Conservatives would have been much more successful than they were with their help, and we believe the Conservative leaders are now fully convinced that such is the case. It looks very like it when we find it proclaimed that in the event that the Hon. J. M. Gibson and Mr. J. T. Middleton be unseated for Hamilton, two straight Conservatives will oppose them, instead of the Church by Rev. Father Constantine, C. P. The new convert had studied the works of his distinguished uncle; but the prayers and example of his believing wife disarmed his prejudices, led him to investigate the claims of the Church, and he was finally won over to the faith."

ORANGEISM IN THE PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

We notice by the Shawville *Equity*, published at Shawville, in the county of Pontiac, that the 12th of July was celebrated at Bristol, the principal town of the county, in very demonstrative fashion.

We by no means desire to abridge the liberties of our Protestant fellow-citizens, whether Orange or otherwise, and we are glad that they should enjoy the largest possible amount of liberty of speech within the bounds of reason, and even beyond, provided they do not excite their hearers to actual deeds of violence against their neighbors, as the promoters of anarchy are wont to do at their gatherings. But with all our regard for freedom of speech we submit that such language as was used by the speakers on the occasion we refer to, in the midst of a Catholic community, is calculated to stir up strife, and to lead to breaches of the peace; and seemingly it was for such purpose that the language was used by men who, professing to be ministers of the gospel of peace and good-will among men, nevertheless make it their sole mission on earth to stir up ill-will, and to excite their hearers to hatred of their fellow-citizens, by repeating in public the most atrocious falsehoods.

What would we think of a Catholic priest who in one of our Ontario towns would at a public demonstration assert that every Protestant minister had taken an oath against Catholic doctrine, which in reality he had not taken, to the effect that Roman Catholic doctrines are damnable, and that those who will be damned who will not forsake them; and who, on this basis would endeavor to excite the hatred of his hearers against his Protestant neighbors?

Would not such language and conduct be deemed to be an incitement to riot and acts of violence? Yet exactly in this way did one of the preachers present speak of the Catholic clergy, and he was vociferously applauded by the audience, who evidently delighted in hearing such barefaced misrepresentations.

The Rev. Mr. Dilworth, of the Church of England, was the chief preacher who thus spoke. He said: "I am here as an Orangeman, and not as a politician. . . . Then again, I am here as an English Churchman, proud to belong to a body which has, in now, and yet do more to give to the world the word of Truth, to expose the falsity and corruptions of Rome, and to destroy Papal influence, than any other body in existence. To prove that this is so, I have but to point out the fact that Rome singles out above all others, the English Catholic Church against which to hurl her curses. . . . Listen, for example, to the oath which must be taken by every man before ordination into the Romish priesthood: 'I will defend the doctrines, rights and customs of His Holiness, against all usurpers, especially against the now pretended authority of the Church of England, and all adherents, and I do further declare the doctrines of the Church of England to be damnable, and those to be damned who will not forsake them.'"

It is not for us to maintain that the doctrines of the Church of England are correct and true. If we believed this to be the case, we should become members of that Church; but the oath of which Mr. Dilworth speaks is a mere fiction; yet he has the superlative effrontery to say: "My primary object in being present is a religious one." He should have said: "My primary object is to belie my neighbors, and to excite you to hate them whom Christ commanded you to love."

The Catholic rite of ordination is no secret. The Roman Pontifical in which it is to be found entire may be purchased at any Catholic bookstore; but it contains nothing bearing any resemblance to Rev. Mr. Dilworth's fable. But let us look into the formularies of some of the Protestant churches around us, and see what they say of Catholics and the Pope. The Presbyterian Confession, which may also be readily purchased, declares the Pope to be anti-Christ, and the "Man of sin" denounced by the apostle; and we further find the following clauses in the "National Covenant or Confession of Faith subscribed at first by the King's Majesty, and his household in the year 1580; thereafter by persons of all ranks (in Scotland) . . . for the maintaining of the true Christian religion . . . and subscribed by barons, nobles, gentlemen, burgesses, ministers and commons in the year 1638; and approved by the General Assembly 1638 and 1639 . . . upon application of the General Assembly, and Act of the General Assembly, ratified by an Act of Parliament, 1640, and subscribed by King Charles II. at Spey, June 23, 1650, and Scoon, January 1, 1651."

When we does it come then that we have found Mr. McCarthy always ready, during the last few years, at least, to start an agitation against the Catholic school system of Ontario and the other Provinces of the Dominion? To this problem there is but one solution. Either he is animated by a spirit of hatred against Catholics, or he is pandering to the feelings of animosity which he knows to be innate in the breasts of a considerable proportion of the Protestant population of the Province. In either case some light is thrown upon the so-called Equal Rights movement of five years ago, in which Mr. McCarthy was the leading spirit, a movement of which, indeed, he was the parent. It is evident that it was not a movement for Equal Rights, but one the object of which was simply the persecution of Catholics.

We are aware, of course, that Mr. McCarthy's apologists will say in answer to this that this gentleman has already explained his meaning to be, not that he is in favor of Separate schools, or of denominational teaching, but that he believes that a system of common Christianity should be devised which would be acceptable to Catholics and Protestants alike, and that this system should be taught in the schools, as the solution to the problem of religious education. The fact remains, however, that he is in favor of religious teaching, as being necessary for children. Now, surely Mr. McCarthy should be a practical man. If religious teaching is necessary, as he asserts, in order to make sure that future generations shall be moral, are we to wait until the new-fangled relig-

ion which he has in view shall be invented? It certainly does not exist now. It may be years before it will be elaborated; and must the children of the present day be kept in ignorance of their duties until it shall be completed?

A more absurd proposition than this of Mr. McCarthy can scarcely be conceived. Under it, according to his own admissions, a godless generation may grow up; and by the time the religion shall be patched up which he hopes to be the one of the future, there will be a generation in existence which will not have that religion at all, and will only reject his nostrum. Will it not be far better, then, to have the religion or religions in which people believe now taught in the schools until the Utopia which Mr. McCarthy has imagined shall have a real existence? If such be the case, he ought to be an advocate for the continuance of the Catholic schools, at least as a necessity for the time being. It will be time enough to establish the prospective religion in the school curriculum when it shall have been invented; but what we want for the present time is a religious teaching which will be acceptable to people now living.

What would we think of a Catholic priest who in one of our Ontario towns would at a public demonstration assert that every Protestant minister had taken an oath against Catholic doctrine, which in reality he had not taken, to the effect that Roman Catholic doctrines are damnable, and that those who will be damned who will not forsake them; and who, on this basis would endeavor to excite the hatred of his hearers against his Protestant neighbors?

Would not such language and conduct be deemed to be an incitement to riot and acts of violence? Yet exactly in this way did one of the preachers present speak of the Catholic clergy, and he was vociferously applauded by the audience, who evidently delighted in hearing such barefaced misrepresentations.

The Rev. Mr. Dilworth, of the Church of England, was the chief preacher who thus spoke. He said: "I am here as an Orangeman, and not as a politician. . . . Then again, I am here as an English Churchman, proud to belong to a body which has, in now, and yet do more to give to the world the word of Truth, to expose the falsity and corruptions of Rome, and to destroy Papal influence, than any other body in existence. To prove that this is so, I have but to point out the fact that Rome singles out above all others, the English Catholic Church against which to hurl her curses. . . . Listen, for example, to the oath which must be taken by every man before ordination into the Romish priesthood: 'I will defend the doctrines, rights and customs of His Holiness, against all usurpers, especially against the now pretended authority of the Church of England, and all adherents, and I do further declare the doctrines of the Church of England to be damnable, and those to be damned who will not forsake them.'"

It is not for us to maintain that the doctrines of the Church of England are correct and true. If we believed this to be the case, we should become members of that Church; but the oath of which Mr. Dilworth speaks is a mere fiction; yet he has the superlative effrontery to say: "My primary object in being present is a religious one." He should have said: "My primary object is to belie my neighbors, and to excite you to hate them whom Christ commanded you to love."

The Catholic rite of ordination is no secret. The Roman Pontifical in which it is to be found entire may be purchased at any Catholic bookstore; but it contains nothing bearing any resemblance to Rev. Mr. Dilworth's fable. But let us look into the formularies of some of the Protestant churches around us, and see what they say of Catholics and the Pope. The Presbyterian Confession, which may also be readily purchased, declares the Pope to be anti-Christ, and the "Man of sin" denounced by the apostle; and we further find the following clauses in the "National Covenant or Confession of Faith subscribed at first by the King's Majesty, and his household in the year 1580; thereafter by persons of all ranks (in Scotland) . . . for the maintaining of the true Christian religion . . . and subscribed by barons, nobles, gentlemen, burgesses, ministers and commons in the year 1638; and approved by the General Assembly 1638 and 1639 . . . upon application of the General Assembly, and Act of the General Assembly, ratified by an Act of Parliament, 1640, and subscribed by King Charles II. at Spey, June 23, 1650, and Scoon, January 1, 1651."

When we does it come then that we have found Mr. McCarthy always ready, during the last few years, at least, to start an agitation against the Catholic school system of Ontario and the other Provinces of the Dominion? To this problem there is but one solution. Either he is animated by a spirit of hatred against Catholics, or he is pandering to the feelings of animosity which he knows to be innate in the breasts of a considerable proportion of the Protestant population of the Province. In either case some light is thrown upon the so-called Equal Rights movement of five years ago, in which Mr. McCarthy was the leading spirit, a movement of which, indeed, he was the parent. It is evident that it was not a movement for Equal Rights, but one the object of which was simply the persecution of Catholics.

We are aware, of course, that Mr. McCarthy's apologists will say in answer to this that this gentleman has already explained his meaning to be, not that he is in favor of Separate schools, or of denominational teaching, but that he believes that a system of common Christianity should be devised which would be acceptable to Catholics and Protestants alike, and that this system should be taught in the schools, as the solution to the problem of religious education. The fact remains, however, that he is in favor of religious teaching, as being necessary for children. Now, surely Mr. McCarthy should be a practical man. If religious teaching is necessary, as he asserts, in order to make sure that future generations shall be moral, are we to wait until the new-fangled relig-

ion which he has in view shall be invented? It certainly does not exist now. It may be years before it will be elaborated; and must the children of the present day be kept in ignorance of their duties until it shall be completed?

A more absurd proposition than this of Mr. McCarthy can scarcely be conceived. Under it, according to his own admissions, a godless generation may grow up; and by the time the religion shall be patched up which he hopes to be the one of the future, there will be a generation in existence which will not have that religion at all, and will only reject his nostrum. Will it not be far better, then, to have the religion or religions in which people believe now taught in the schools until the Utopia which Mr. McCarthy has imagined shall have a real existence? If such be the case, he ought to be an advocate for the continuance of the Catholic schools, at least as a necessity for the time being. It will be time enough to establish the prospective religion in the school curriculum when it shall have been invented; but what we want for the present time is a religious teaching which will be acceptable to people now living.

What would we think of a Catholic priest who in one of our Ontario towns would at a public demonstration assert that every Protestant minister had taken an oath against Catholic doctrine, which in reality he had not taken, to the effect that Roman Catholic doctrines are damnable, and that those who will be damned who will not forsake them; and who, on this basis would endeavor to excite the hatred of his hearers against his Protestant neighbors?

Would not such language and conduct be deemed to be an incitement to riot and acts of violence? Yet exactly in this way did one of the preachers present speak of the Catholic clergy, and he was vociferously applauded by the audience, who evidently delighted in hearing such barefaced misrepresentations.

The Rev. Mr. Dilworth, of the Church of England, was the chief preacher who thus spoke. He said: "I am here as an Orangeman, and not as a politician. . . . Then again, I am here as an English Churchman, proud to belong to a body which has, in now, and yet do more to give to the world the word of Truth, to expose the falsity and corruptions of Rome, and to destroy Papal influence, than any other body in existence. To prove that this is so, I have but to point out the fact that Rome singles out above all others, the English Catholic Church against which to hurl her curses. . . . Listen, for example, to the oath which must be taken by every man before ordination into the Romish priesthood: 'I will defend the doctrines, rights and customs of His Holiness, against all usurpers, especially against the now pretended authority of the Church of England, and all adherents, and I do further declare the doctrines of the Church of England to be damnable, and those to be damned who will not forsake them.'"

ion which he has in view shall be invented? It certainly does not exist now. It may be years before it will be elaborated; and must the children of the present day be kept in ignorance of their duties until it shall be completed?

A more absurd proposition than this of Mr. McCarthy can scarcely be conceived. Under it, according to his own admissions, a godless generation may grow up; and by the time the religion shall be patched up which he hopes to be the one of the future, there will be a generation in existence which will not have that religion at all, and will only reject his nostrum. Will it not be far better, then, to have the religion or religions in which people believe now taught in the schools until the Utopia which Mr. McCarthy has imagined shall have a real existence? If such be the case, he ought to be an advocate for the continuance of the Catholic schools, at least as a necessity for the time being. It will be time enough to establish the prospective religion in the school curriculum when it shall have been invented; but what we want for the present time is a religious teaching which will be acceptable to people now living.

What would we think of a Catholic priest who in one of our Ontario towns would at a public demonstration assert that every Protestant minister had taken an oath against Catholic doctrine, which in reality he had not taken, to the effect that Roman Catholic doctrines are damnable, and that those who will be damned who will not forsake them; and who, on this basis would endeavor to excite the hatred of his hearers against his Protestant neighbors?

Would not such language and conduct be deemed to be an incitement to riot and acts of violence? Yet exactly in this way did one of the preachers present speak of the Catholic clergy, and he was vociferously applauded by the audience, who evidently delighted in hearing such barefaced misrepresentations.

The Rev. Mr. Dilworth, of the Church of England, was the chief preacher who thus spoke. He said: "I am here as an Orangeman, and not as a politician. . . . Then again, I am here as an English Churchman, proud to belong to a body which has, in now, and yet do more to give to the world the word of Truth, to expose the falsity and corruptions of Rome, and to destroy Papal influence, than any other body in existence. To prove that this is so, I have but to point out the fact that Rome singles out above all others, the English Catholic Church against which to hurl her curses. . . . Listen, for example, to the oath which must be taken by every man before ordination into the Romish priesthood: 'I will defend the doctrines, rights and customs of His Holiness, against all usurpers, especially against the now pretended authority of the Church of England, and all adherents, and I do further declare the doctrines of the Church of England to be damnable, and those to be damned who will not forsake them.'"

It is not for us to maintain that the doctrines of the Church of England are correct and true. If we believed this to be the case, we should become members of that Church; but the oath of which Mr. Dilworth speaks is a mere fiction; yet he has the superlative effrontery to say: "My primary object in being present is a religious one." He should have said: "My primary object is to belie my neighbors, and to excite you to hate them whom Christ commanded you to love."

The Catholic rite of ordination is no secret. The Roman Pontifical in which it is to be found entire may be purchased at any Catholic bookstore; but it contains nothing bearing any resemblance to Rev. Mr. Dilworth's fable. But let us look into the formularies of some of the Protestant churches around us, and see what they say of Catholics and the Pope. The Presbyterian Confession, which may also be readily purchased, declares the Pope to be anti-Christ, and the "Man of sin" denounced by the apostle; and we further find the following clauses in the "National Covenant or Confession of Faith subscribed at first by the King's Majesty, and his household in the year 1580; thereafter by persons of all ranks (in Scotland) . . . for the maintaining of the true Christian religion . . . and subscribed by barons, nobles, gentlemen, burgesses, ministers and commons in the year 1638; and approved by the General Assembly 1638 and 1639 . . . upon application of the General Assembly, and Act of the General Assembly, ratified by an Act of Parliament, 1640, and subscribed by King Charles II. at Spey, June 23, 1650, and Scoon, January 1, 1651."

When we does it come then that we have found Mr. McCarthy always ready, during the last few years, at least, to start an agitation against the Catholic school system of Ontario and the other Provinces of the Dominion? To this problem there is but one solution. Either he is animated by a spirit of hatred against Catholics, or he is pandering to the feelings of animosity which he knows to be innate in the breasts of a considerable proportion of the Protestant population of the Province. In either case some light is thrown upon the so-called Equal Rights movement of five years ago, in which Mr. McCarthy was the leading spirit, a movement of which, indeed, he was the parent. It is evident that it was not a movement for Equal Rights, but one the object of which was simply the persecution of Catholics.

We are aware, of course, that Mr. McCarthy's apologists will say in answer to this that this gentleman has already explained his meaning to be, not that he is in favor of Separate schools, or of denominational teaching, but that he believes that a system of common Christianity should be devised which would be acceptable to Catholics and Protestants alike, and that this system should be taught in the schools, as the solution to the problem of religious education. The fact remains, however, that he is in favor of religious teaching, as being necessary for children. Now, surely Mr. McCarthy should be a practical man. If religious teaching is necessary, as he asserts, in order to make sure that future generations shall be moral, are we to wait until the new-fangled relig-

ion which he has in view shall be invented? It certainly does not exist now. It may be years before it will be elaborated; and must the children of the present day be kept in ignorance of their duties until it shall be completed?

A more absurd proposition than this of Mr. McCarthy can scarcely be conceived. Under it, according to his own admissions, a godless generation may grow up; and by the time the religion shall be patched up which he hopes to be the one of the future, there will be a generation in existence which will not have that religion at all, and will only reject his nostrum. Will it not be far better, then, to have the religion or religions in which people believe now taught in the schools until the Utopia which Mr. McCarthy has imagined shall have a real existence? If such be the case, he ought to be an advocate for the continuance of the Catholic schools, at least as a necessity for the time being. It will be time enough to establish the prospective religion in the school curriculum when it shall have been invented; but what we want for the present time is a religious teaching which will be acceptable to people now living.

What would we think of a Catholic priest who in one of our Ontario towns would at a public demonstration assert that every Protestant minister had taken an oath against Catholic doctrine, which in reality he had not taken, to the effect that Roman Catholic doctrines are damnable, and that those who will be damned who will not forsake them; and who, on this basis would endeavor to excite the hatred of his hearers against his Protestant neighbors?

Would not such language and conduct be deemed to be an incitement to riot and acts of violence? Yet exactly in this way did one of the preachers present speak of the Catholic clergy, and he was vociferously applauded by the audience, who evidently delighted in hearing such barefaced misrepresentations.

The Rev. Mr. Dilworth, of the Church of England, was the chief preacher who thus spoke. He said: "I am here as an Orangeman, and not as a politician. . . . Then again, I am here as an English Churchman, proud to belong to a body which has, in now, and yet do more to give to the world the word of Truth, to expose the falsity and corruptions of Rome, and to destroy Papal influence, than any other body in existence. To prove that this is so, I have but to point out the fact that Rome singles out above all others, the English Catholic Church against which to hurl her curses. . . . Listen, for example, to the oath which must be taken by every man before ordination into the Romish priesthood: 'I will defend the doctrines, rights and customs of His Holiness, against all usurpers, especially against the now pretended authority of the Church of England, and all adherents, and I do further declare the doctrines of the Church of England to be damnable, and those to be damned who will not forsake them.'"

case, let Protestants know that their weapons are light and truth; and if with these they fail, their failure is more honorable than any success won by deceit and darkness.

J. A. MACDONALD.  
St. Thomas, July 20, 1894.

THE SCHOOL QUESTION IN MANITOBA AND THE NORTH-WEST.

A most important order-in-council has been adopted by the Dominion Government and transmitted to the Lieutenant-Governors of Manitoba and the North-West Territories, on the subject of the laws recently passed by which Separate schools have been abolished in those districts.

The order-in-council, is a consequence of the memorial addressed by His Eminence the Cardinal, Archbishop Taschereau, and the Archbishops and Bishops of Canada, to the Dominion Government, asking redress for the grievances inflicted on the Catholics of the Province of Manitoba and the North-West Territory by their recent legislation in regard to schools. The memorial is referred to as stating that the result of the new system adopted in Manitoba has been "the legal suppression of all Catholic schools, and the maintenance of all Protestant schools," so that "the Roman Catholic ratepayers have now to help in the support of Protestant schools, which are exactly what they are, and to which, naturally, Roman Catholic parents cannot conscientiously send their children."

The memorial also states that "in the North-West, the Roman Catholic schools have been retained, but by the Act of 1892 they are deprived of their liberty of action, and of the character which distinguishes them from other schools," and thus "the result is very detrimental to the cause of education, and really has in both cases created bad feeling, dissensions, and most deplorable results."

The fact that in the name and by the authority of Her Majesty it was promised to the inhabitants of the territory that all the religious rights and privileges enjoyed by them would be assured to them and respected on their union with the Dominion of Canada, is then referred to, and the order-in-council requests the respective Governments to lay before their Legislatures this memorial for their careful consideration, with a view to remedy all well-founded grievances of which the Roman Catholics complain.

The present action of the Government is worthy of all praise; and in the interest of peace it is to be hoped that the Governments addressed will take the steps recommended to them. Hitherto they have not shown a disposition to give any redress; but they will at least understand now that their action has not been condoned, and that the highest authority in the Empire will be appealed to for redress, if they neglect to afford it.

EDITORIAL NOTES.  
MRS. MARGARET L. SHEPHERD has been expelled from the Women's P. P. A., called also the "Loyal Protestant Women of Canada," a society organized by her, and of which she has been the honorary Supreme President down to the present time. The *Hamilton Times* has been authorized to state that the office of the Honorary Supreme President is to be dispensed with, and that the association "is not now in any way connected with Mrs. Margaret L. Shepherd, who formerly held that office." This step was taken in consequence of revelations which did no credit to the character of Mrs. Shepherd—that is, whatever of character was left to her after her own sworn testimony given in Toronto in regard to her past history. As Mrs. S. will no longer be the Supreme Protector of Protestantism in Ontario, it remains to be seen whether the peculiar form of Protestantism she protected will survive her extinction. Mrs. Youmans will now be the Supreme President of the Association of Loyal Women. The late Honorary President will still retain the open Bible which was presented to her by the Mayor of London as a testimony to his special regard for so worthy an individual.

A RECENT issue of one of the religious papers of New York gave an account of a "bicycle sermon" recently delivered, wherein the preacher took a bicycle into the pulpit for his text. The sermon was, in fact, an advertisement for the firm which had manufactured the bicycle, and all the particularly good points of the steel ribbed racer were mentioned as an illustration of his theme. The sermon was

attributed to a Methodist preacher, but further enquiry has shown that it was in a Baptist church that this occurrence took place. The pulpit of the present day is frequently prostituted from its purpose in a similar manner; and a couple of weeks ago a St. Louis paper gave a list of seven or eight subjects equally ridiculous which had been preached the Sunday previous in various churches of that city.

In view of the fact that ex-Indian Commissioner Morgan, in his recent manifest against Catholic education, proclaimed that he found a cross on the Catholic schools in the west, instead of the Stars and Stripes, the following words of Archbishop Ireland, which were written in answer to a correspondent, are very appropriate, as showing how the national flag is regarded by the Catholic church. He says:

"The American flag is welcome to every Catholic Church in the country, and that 'no permission or dispensation from priest or Bishop is needed or given' when it is wrapped around the coffin of a veteran and borne up the aisle toward the sanctuary. It is the symbol of the republic, and as such is held at all times in all due honor by the Church."

There was no special reason for putting the American flag over the schools of the Indians, any more than over any other schools of the country; and Mr. Morgan was merely making a ridiculous appeal to the prejudices of the people in speaking in such a manner. There would not have been the least objection to the national flag on the Catholic school-houses, if it had been customary to put flags on the school-houses of the country. But surely the religious emblem of Christianity was especially appropriate on Christian schools in the midst of a pagan community.

SEVERAL of the Protestant religious papers have recently mentioned, as something remarkable, the fact that the Archbishop of Paris recognizes and encourages the Sunday schools which he calls "that very excellent institution." These journals seem to imagine that Catholics do not use Sunday schools, on the hypothesis that the Church desires to keep the people in ignorance; but the truth is that religious education is essentially a Catholic institution, and that our children are taught their religion both on Sundays and the other days of the week. Sunday schools are not neglected by the Catholic Church, though the teaching on Sunday is not so necessary when religious teaching is carefully given every day, as it is the case in all our Catholic schools.

Toronto, Aug. 3, 1894.  
To the Editor of the CATHOLIC RECORD:  
Dear Sir—I wish to inform you and the public in general that the current issue of the *Catholic Register*, of Toronto, my connection with that paper ceases. Yours truly,  
J. R. TEEFY.

Discussion at Chautauqua.  
The leading subject for discussion at the Chautauqua summer school this year is to be "The Reunion of Christendom." It is also a subject in which the Pope is deeply interested, but the union for which he prays is not the unity that will be advocated at Protestant Chautauqua. He exhorts all Christians to come together as one solid army of the Lord under the standard of the Cross. The only Christian union which will find favor at Chautauqua is union against Rome. Even in the Protestant Churches alone the present tendencies are toward further disruption rather than towards union. The Presbyterian Church is now divided into two factions radically opposed in doctrine, and this discord extends, in a greater or less measure, into every other Protestant denomination described as evangelical. It is loudest among the Congregationalists, but the Baptists and Methodists are not free from it, though outwardly there may be harmony among them. Some of their prominent theologians are known to be sympathizers with the views of Dr. Briggs. The old reverence for the Bible as absolute truth sent from God has received a shock which has extended throughout Protestantism with a disrupting force. In the Episcopal Church the ritualistic or Catholic party is pushing ahead aggressively and making broader the separation between it and the Protestant party. It opposes Roman Catholicism because of the Papacy, but it has no toleration and no respect for Protestantism. It recognizes the Church of Rome as a branch of the Catholic Church of divine establishment, but it repudiates those it designates as Protestants, treating them as rebels against the true faith.—New York Sun.

Cardinal Moran, Archbishop of Sydney, Australia, has completed his "History of the Catholic Church in Australasia." It will be published simultaneously in Australia and in England before the close of the year.