

## The Catholic Record.

Published weekly at 44 and 46 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE B. NORTHGRAVES,

Author of "Missions of Modern Ireland."

REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY,

THOMAS COFFEY.

Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, Messrs. LUKES KING, JOHN NICH and P. J. NICH are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Agents for Alexandria, Glenora and Loughlin.—Mr. Donald A. McDonald.

Advertisements—Ten cents per line each insertion.

Approved by the Archbishop of Toronto, and recommended by the Archbishops of St. Boniface, St. John, St. Peter, and the Bishops of Hamilton and Peterborough, and leading Catholic Clergymen throughout the Dominion.

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

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

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

## Catholic Record.

Lo. d-n. Sat., Feb. 15th, 1890.

## ORANGE INCORPORATION.

The Orangemen are again asking Parliament for an Act of Incorporation.

They have disguised their request by representing the association as a Benevolent Society doing an insurance business.

Many of the Lodges have passed resolutions stating that they do not wish for incorporation from a Parliament which refused to adopt Colonel O'Brien's anti-Jesuit resolution; as this would have the appearance of accepting a bribe to silence them against complaining of the Dominion Government, but the Grand Lodge at its session in Guelph last summer resolved to ask for incorporation, and the present bill is the consequence of that resolution.

The incorporation of Orangemen under any guise ought to be strenuously refused by Parliament; for it is an association evil in its tendencies and with a bad record.

Recognition of it in any form by the Government of the Dominion would be an encouragement to a lawless and wicked association. It would be an insult to the British Crown, which has always rebuffed the Orangemen in their true colors. Since their effort in 1886 to set aside Queen Victoria from ascending to the throne, their professions of loyalty have been rated at their true value, and when the Prince of Wales visited Canada in 1889, his advisers were specially instructed to give no sort of recognition to Orangemen.

The then Duke of Newcastle carried out strictly the instructions received, and the true spirit of Orangemen was exhibited in their defiant demonstrations on that occasion. Their loyalty is but lip loyalty, and is thoroughly appreciated by the Queen and the heir apparent to the throne.

It would be useless to pass the Act of Incorporation, for it would undoubtedly be vetoed by the Imperial Government, as similar Acts by one of our Provinces have been before.

The Orange press think it a great grievance that Orangemen should be refused incorporation, whereas certain Catholic religious orders have been incorporated, the Jesuits, for example, and the Oblate Fathers of Ottawa. It is an insult to speak of the latter in the same breath.

The Jesuits and Oblate Fathers are resolutions of priests formed for carrying out their missionary and educational work more effectively, and are certainly as much entitled to incorporation as the Anglican Synods of Huron or Toronto.

But it would be an insult to these bodies to put them on a par with Orangemen. Jesuits and Oblates have only good objects in view, but Orangemen have no feature to recommend it. It is not likely, however, that the Incorporation Bill will pass. It would be a great pity for the Orangemen themselves if it were to pass, for they are very much in want of a grievance to give them a subject for their protests every twelfth of July. The passage of such a bill would be like putting a knife through an inflated bladder. It would take the wind from our dog day orators. By all means let the Bill be negatived by as unanimous a vote as that by which Col. O'Brien's anti-Jesuit motion was kicked out of the House in disgrace.

The purpose of the Bill now before Parliament is to enable the lodges to hold real estate. The Grand Lodge of the Dominion is to be empowered to hold estate to the value of \$200,000, Provincial lodges to \$100,000, and subordinate lodges smaller amounts. Mr. Blake, in his speech against Dominion incorporation of the order in 1884, very properly pointed out that this dealing with the rights of property is properly a Provincial matter with which the Dominion Parliament should not interfere in any case, except where interprovincial interests require interprovincial powers to be conferred, as in the case of Dominion railway corporations. In the case of the Orangemen no such condition exists.

The application of the Orangemen is made to the Dominion Parliament, not because Provincial incorporation would fail to give the society the powers of an insurance company but because they are conscious that some Provinces

will not incorporate them. The object of the measure is, therefore, to override the will of those Provinces; Quebec, for example, which will give no encouragement to Orangemen in any shape. It is an attempt to override the legislation of the Provinces in a matter which specially pertains to them, and on constitutional grounds. All who desire to see the principle of self-government upheld which lies at the root of the Canadian Confederation will oppose this coming effort to thwart the intentions of the Provinces, and all who know that Orangemen are essentially a society engendered and nurtured in a spirit of hate, and of domination of class over class, ought resolutely to oppose this attempt to foist upon the Provinces by Dominion legislation a corporation which some Provinces would undoubtedly and which all ought to repudiate.

The Globe of the 21st ult., "for the consideration of Orangemen," puts forward the theory that the Orange Incorporation Bill is really a cunning device of the Jesuits, represented in the Dominion Government by Sir John Thompson, to commit members of Parliament to the principle of Dominion incorporation for Associations which have local objects, so that they may themselves afterwards secure Dominion incorporation. It is not surprising that the Globe, favoring as it did the assertion of the Equal Rights petitioners that Jesuitism is an association composed of plotters who are dangerous to the very existence of the State, should imagine that the Jesuits are now plotting against the welfare of the Dominion, and especially against Provincial rights. But the Globe should bear in mind what itself states in the same article that such is "clearly not the opinion of the Dominion Parliament, or the Government, or the Governor General, or the law officers of the Crown." There is a goodly array of legal talent which does not estimate the Jesuits according to the judgment passed upon them by Drs. Wild and Caven. The Globe itself acknowledges that the hypothesis is purely imaginary—and we give it credit for common sense enough to know that it is as absurd as it is visionary. The Jesuits of Canada find sufficient occupation in fulfilling their duties, doing good by their missionary and educational work. They have no thought of the horrible plots which are attributed to them by the Rev. Hunters and Bartons, the Charltons, O'Briens and McCarthys. When they will look for incorporation in Ontario they will do so on the merits of their own institution, and not through the medium of Orange incorporation.

The Orange Lodges of Barrie and Petrolia are among those which are of opinion that Orange incorporation ought not to be asked from the present Parliament. The Barrie District Lodge recently resolved that "it would be a degradation to our association to ask the present Dominion Parliament for an Act of Incorporation." Parliament should take them at their word.

## REV. DR. C. O'REILLY'S TREASURERSHIP.

Rumors have been afloat for some time that Dr. O'Reilly's accounts were kept in a loose manner, and that some of the large sums he received, as treasurer of the Irish National League, could not be satisfactorily accounted for.

Red Jim McDermott, the Castle spy and informer, lately told some newspaper reporter in England that Dr. O'Reilly's accounts were short by \$50,000. Members of the Clan-na-Gael and other secret societies, who dislike the doctor's opposition to secret manoeuvres of every kind, were only too glad to repeat and spread broadcast the aspersions on Dr. O'Reilly's financial capacity, some of the daily papers even going so far as to hint at a want of honesty on his part. To satisfy the Irish public in America and to silence the maligners, Dr. O'Reilly appealed to Hon. John Fitzgerald, President of the National League, for the appointment of competent auditors who would thoroughly examine his books, vouchers, letters and all other papers bearing on the subject of his treasurer's ship. The hon. president immediately sent out a circular calling a meeting of all the most prominent men of the League, who, on their arrival in Detroit, would form a committee of inquiry and appoint auditors. Several of those gentlemen were not able to attend, but sent letters expressive of the utmost confidence in Dr. O'Reilly's honesty and business capacity. The auditors appointed were able, shrewd and experienced cashiers, bankers and book-keepers. Among them were Hon. Richard Oushing, Mayor of Omaha; John Atkinson, Detroit; Philip McCall, expert accountant, St. Louis, Mo. The former was appointed chairman and the latter secretary of the examining committee.

The Detroit Free Press of Saturday last says: "The Dr. C. O'Reilly Auditing Committee brought its proceedings to a close yesterday afternoon, and issued its official report. Dr. O'Reilly's accounts were found in perfect order, and balance to a cent."

In closing its work the committee addressed an official letter to the Hon. J. Fitzgerald, and said, among other interesting matters: "Our sessions were held with open doors, free to the public and the representatives of the press. Your Committee found a model system of books kept by the treasurer, consisting of a cash book, in which the daily receipts of moneys were entered, giving the name of the party remitting, the date and name of the place from which the remittance came. The cash book's credit side shows all disbursements and remittances, and for what purpose. Your committee also found a ledger arranged alphabetically in the order of states and counties with complete indexes for convenient reference. The receipt of moneys sent to Ireland were signed by either Joseph Biggar, M. P., T. Harrington, M. P., or Joseph Kenny, M. P. At the last national convention in 1886 the treasurer reported a balance of \$21,685.75; that he has since then received from all sources \$257,922.79; that he has paid out for operating expenses \$22,225.27; and that he has remitted to Ireland \$237,258.08. The item of \$22,225.27 for expenses include all the cost and expenses incurred by the holding of the National Convention in Chicago and also President Fitzgerald's salary, \$3,000. As the latter gentleman handed back this sum the actual expense of the League amounts to \$19,225.27, being less than 7 per cent. of all the moneys received."

Among the contributions to the National Irish League Fund, Canada has the fourth place in its quota of money sent, \$16,700.85. Pennsylvania sent the highest, \$40,738.41; Massachusetts \$34,901.66, and New York \$23,966.33. The total receipts were \$257,922.79; balance in hand at last convention, \$21,857.78. Grand total, \$279,808.78. Total of sums sent to Ireland were \$237,258.08, which, with expenses and \$30,335.23 cash balance in hand, falls to the cent with the amount received as above.

The committee finally reports: "We are led to say that upon the score of economy and honesty the League is to be congratulated on the admirable manner in which its finances have been administered by the Rev. Dr. Charles O'Reilly, to whom a deep debt of gratitude is due for the onerous and responsible duties so faithfully performed and discharged by him."

We feel a very sincere pleasure in being able to add our heartfelt congratulations to those of the gentleman, composing the committee, and of telling him that whatever others may have been conjecturing or dividing the Canadian contributors to the Irish National League fund had never the most remote idea of suspicion that the moneys sent by them to Dr. O'Reilly were not in safe keeping, or would not find their way to the patriotic and glorious object for which they were intended.

The American branch of the Irish National League was a power in the hands of the Irish leader. Not only its magnificent contributions but also its prestige and powerful influence over English and American politics have wonderfully and on an incalculable extent helped on the cause of Ireland's emancipation, which is now approaching at rapid strides its complete and happy triumph. The general election, which is looked for in Great Britain by next June or July, must result in an overwhelming majority for Gladstone, Parnell and an Irish Parliament in College Green.

## ARCHBISHOP CLEARY IN TWEED.

The anti Catholic press take special delight in heaping abuse upon His Grace the Most Reverend Dr. Cleary, Archbishop of Kingston. His Grace has proved himself to be a determined and resolute defender of the rights of Catholics, and this is enough to bring upon him all the ire of those whose earnest desire it is to reduce the Catholics of Ontario to a position of inferiority to the Protestant majority.

The same persecuting spirit which dictated the enactment of the most heartless penal laws against Catholics during the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries lives in Ontario to-day, the difference being that it has not now the influence and power which it exerted in the centuries which are passed and gone. There was a time when, on the least pretence, and when even by a fictitious story, public opinion could be so excited against Catholics that Parliament could pass, and were even compelled to pass, most atrocious laws, depriving Catholics, not only of their civil rights, but of their property and lives, for no offence except that they were faithful to their religion.

Those days have passed away, as we hope, never to return; but the spirit of bigotry is not dead. To bigotry is a great shock to be told by a Catholic, whether Bishop, priest or layman, that we Catholics of Ontario feel ourselves to be citizens equally with themselves, and that as such we mean to assert our rights. If an election takes place at which Protestants are divided, perhaps on the very question whether Catholics should be deprived of their most sacred rights, if the chief part of the Catholic vote happens to be cast

upon the winning side, and that a small Protestant majority be thus counterbalanced, there will be at once an appeal made to Protestant prejudices to take vengeance on Catholics who have thus ventured to use their rights as citizens. This was, in fact, done on the occasion of the mayoralty election in Toronto, and at the election of a member of the Legislature in West Lumbton.

His Grace Archbishop Cleary, on Sunday, the 2nd inst., delivered an address to the Catholics of Tweed, in which, speaking of the outcry against Separate schools, which has been recently raised in this Province under the false pretence of "Equal Rights," told the congregation plainly that the Catholic people of Ontario should not cringe before the demon of bigotry. Referring to the opponents of Catholic education he used strong language, but not at all stronger than the state of the case justifies.

His Grace said that Catholic education is of the utmost importance, and that "The everlasting contest between Jesus Christ and Satan—between the kingdom of God and the spirit of wickedness in high places—is waged in the school room."

This is perfectly true. The aim of those who wish to destroy, or to weaken our Catholic school system, is to destroy Catholic faith in the rising generation. But His Grace informs the people of Tweed, and through them the general public, that the Catholics of Ontario are determined to maintain Catholic schools. Over and over again we have been told by the anti-Catholic press that the clergy and not the laity of the Church favor these schools. They endeavor to asperses the Catholic people from the clergy, but His Grace informs them that

"All the Catholic people of Ontario will prove that the vain politician who made the futile effort in London, to divide the Catholic clergy and people, shall not succeed in his effort to set the people against their chief pastors whom the Holy Ghost has appointed to rule the Church of God."

Separate schools have increased in number during the past decade. What does this prove, unless that the Catholics of the Province are bent upon giving a Catholic education to their children? What injury can accrue to the Protestants of the Province from this? Certainly none; and if a faction there be in the Province which makes it their policy to restrict our rights in this regard, it is our duty to treat such faction as our worst enemies, by whatever name they may call themselves.

The Archbishop points out that in improving the status of our Separate schools, we are doing what the constitution of the country expressly authorizes us to do. He adds:

"We have done it, by God's blessing, in this diocese of Kingston, and in all the other dioceses of Ontario, and shall continue to do it, and this very day we shall make a new advance. From this holy place I announce and ordain that you and I will, please God, have a Separate school established in Tweed before the end of next summer."

The Catholics of Ontario are under a debt of gratitude to His Grace for sounding the keynote of the refrain to which they will march to the battle for religious liberty. The CATHOLIC RECORD has all along contended just as His Grace does in his address to the people of Tweed, that we are not to ask as a favor the right of educating our children in accordance with our conscientious convictions. We insist upon it as the inalienable right of Catholic parents, and wherever a politician declares that he will do his best to deprive us of this right, we discern an enemy.

There are many Protestants who believe that we would be better without Catholic schools. We do not quarrel with them for entertaining this opinion. We are not of the same belief ourselves, and we ask these Protestants honestly and in fair play, not to force their opinion upon us, and not to take away our liberties. If they are willing to grant us the liberty we demand, we shall regard them as friends, but if, like Mr. Meredith in his Opera House speech, they declare that they will endeavor to cripple our Catholic schools, in order to force us to give them up, we say plainly, we must regard them as enemies, and on these principles must the battle for freedom of education be fought.

The Free Press, of this city, in its issue of last Saturday, makes an attempt to destroy the force of the Archbishop of Kingston's remarks by half a column of virulent personal abuse of His Grace. It says that "the people of Ontario, taken as a whole, and excepting those that have not risen to the level attained in Italy, France, and in the Republics of South America, care not a jot for his denunciations, and that all his rash talk as to the 'standard of the devil' being planted here is simply laughed at."

His Grace has, undoubtedly, used very plain and forcible language, but not more so than the state of the case justifies. The effort to turn religion out of the Catholic schools is undoubtedly a satanic work, and those who are engaged in it are really following the standard of Satan, whether they are conscious of it or not. The Free Press may pre-

tend to laugh at the firm stand which the Catholics of the Province are determined to take in defence of parental rights, but it may find that an affection of laughter will not secure the victory for its friends. Let those laugh who will. Archbishop Cleary has done no more than to inform the public that the Catholics of the Province do not intend to submit passively to those who would deprive them of religious liberty. The Free Press and other anti-Catholic journals take pleasure in misrepresenting Dr. Cleary's words as if they were applicable only to those Protestants who are engaged in the very dirty work of exciting hatred against their Catholic fellow-citizens. These only are the enemies with whom we have to contend, and we accept the contest without flinching.

THE EMPIRE ON MR. MEREDITH'S POLICY.

From the course followed by the Free Press since 1886 it was to be expected that wherever Mr. Wm. Meredith would lead that journal would follow. From the Toronto Empire we hoped for moderation, but in Saturday's issue of that journal we find not only a condemnation of His Grace Archbishop Cleary, in his controversy with Mr. Meredith, but a complete endorsement of Mr. Meredith's policy as announced in the Opera House of this city. The Empire ought not to forget that it owes its existence to the fact that the leaders of the Conservative party found it necessary to disclaim the no-Popery cry which was made to do service during the election campaign of 1886. The Mail and the Free Press, as the Conservative organs, then openly proclaimed the same political platform which is thus announced in Saturday's Empire:

"He (Mr. Meredith) has laid down the doctrine that the State, having undertaken to educate its citizens in the public interest and appropriated funds for that purpose, must not be ousted from its jurisdiction by any other authority which seeks to seize control, and that while it will not seek to interfere with religious or denominational teaching where by law permitted, it cannot and must not give up control of secular education to ecclesiastics or anyone else beyond its jurisdiction."

It proceeds to explain that the ecclesiastical authorities should, indeed, see that the truths of religion are duly inculcated, but that secular studies are the province of the State, and that the State must not relinquish that domain. It adds that if Archbishop Cleary asserts that this is a wrong position, "we do not believe either his own people or the people of the Province will sustain him in that view."

If it is the business of the State exclusively to control all the details of education, on the principle that it must look after the interests of the public, on the same principle it ought to make all arrangements for the public health, which is also a matter of much importance. The State ought, therefore, to prescribe in what quantities Mrs. Winslow's Soothing Syrup or Pierce's Purgative Pills should be administered. The Empire forgets that there are such things as individual rights, in its anxiety to have the State assert its universal authority.

The school system of Ontario does not assume that the State is to manage all the details of education. It is one of its excellencies that it leaves much to local control, and especially to parents. Except that the law asserts the right of the children to a certain amount of schooling every year, and some other general matters, the management of the schools is left entirely in the hands of the local school authorities and of the parents. The Empire, therefore, makes a sad blunder when it asserts that the people of Ontario have given the State the entire control of their children's education; and we maintain that parents have natural rights in regard to the education of their children, with which the State is to interfere. Liberty of conscience is one of those rights. Neither the majority of the people, nor the State under any pretext, has the right to prevent parents from giving to their children a religious education, in accordance with their conscientious convictions, or even to impede them in so doing. This is a duty which parents are bound to fulfill—a duty which nature itself as well as revelation tells us must be performed by parents. We say, therefore, that Mr. Meredith, by proposing the political platform which he laid down for the Conservative party during the coming campaign, attacks the dearest liberties of a free people.

It is very true, he pretends not to wish to deprive us of any rights which are secured by the British North America Act; but of what avail will those rights be if they are so hedged round with annoyances that they cannot be freely exercised? It is the declared policy of Mr. Meredith to permit the operation of an Act, which he acknowledges he would have no power to repeal if he were Premier of Ontario to morrow. We thank him little for such gro-

undecision. If he had announced that he would assist us in making our schools more efficient, by putting them on the same financial level as the Public schools, and by giving every facility to desiring supporters of Separate schools to apply their taxes to these schools without hindrance, we would appreciate his good-will. Even so, we would be thankful for but a small favor, for we claim that we are entitled to all this as a right, not as a favor or mere privilege. But instead of this, Mr. Meredith has announced that the present school laws afford too much facility to Catholics to become Separate school supporters. Some difficulties must be thrown in their way, so that both Separate school trustees may be harassed in their work and that the Public schools may catch a few dollars for the education of Protestant children here and there through the Province, from Catholic ratepayers who send their children to Catholic schools, and who naturally desire that their money should go for the education of their own children.

We have had in London an example of how the laws can be administered in such a way as to annoy the Catholic schools. A Mayor elected on the bogus Equal Rights platform orders the city officials to tax all ratepayers as Public school supporters. It is true the Mayor has not succeeded in his purpose, but he found an obedient official who was willing to pretend that there was no proper list of Separate school supporters made out last year and that all citizens must therefore be placed upon the Public school roll unless they come to the City Hall to declare themselves Separate school supporters, a thing which most of them did already years ago. The plot was exploded very simply by the production of the overwhelming evidence of the official's own written acknowledgment that last year's lists had been made out and by the production of the duplicate copy held by the Separate school trustees.

The Public school trustees are never annoyed by such petty attempts at fraud.

In Toronto also we find the property of Separate school supporters placed this year on the Public school roll to the amount of about \$325,000, and the Solicitor of the Toronto Municipal Council declares that the law does not permit the injustice to be remedied. We trust a remedy will be found; but here are grievances which it would be worth Mr. Meredith's while to correct, if he were honest in his professions of desiring to secure "Equal Rights to all, and special privileges to none." Instead of this he is now appealing to the people of Ontario to throw new difficulties in the way of the Separate schools, so that the Public schools may rob them of a few more dollars. Surely no honest Protestant will support such a policy as this.

The Mail and the Free Press are not so brazen-faced as to tell Catholics that they should support Mr. Meredith's demands. It is left for the Empire to do this. We can only say that if the Catholics of Ontario assist Mr. Meredith in bringing his policy to a successful issue they deserve to be the serfs which ex-Bishop Carman of the Methodist Church, and Dr. Wild of the Congregationalists, would make of them.

Here we may add a word on what the Empire says of the discussion which took place recently between Mr. Meredith and the Archbishop of Kingston. The Empire says: "The Archbishop retired from the epistolary contest in which he was lately engaged with Mr. Meredith."

The Archbishop did not retire. Mr. Meredith, finding himself defeated on every point, ignominiously begged that the contest should come to a close. He had not even the manliness to acknowledge that he had unjustly aroused Protestant feeling against Catholics on the false plea that His Grace had approved of a newspaper article which he had not even read, and for which the editor of the newspaper declared himself alone responsible. And further: Mr. Meredith in retiring whiningly declared that he would adhere to his programme and principles, even though the result would be that he would be driven from political life.

The Empire also condemns His Grace for saying that "the diabolical spirit of hatred of religious education has found its way, unfortunately, into the Province of Ontario," and that "Satan has raised his wicked maxims throughout the cities and towns of the Province."

From what we have proved above, it will be seen that nothing but hatred of Catholics and of the Catholic Church influences the enemies of Catholic education to endeavor to destroy our Catholic school system by such annoyances as Mr. Meredith would introduce into it. Even though the language be strong, it is the truth to say that the enemies of religious education are ranged under Satan's standard. If Mr. Meredith and his adherents do not like the association of ideas they should haul down the no-Popery flag.

The Empire raises altogether a false

issue when it pretends that the object of Mr. Meredith is to release Catholic schools from ecclesiastical control. The school laws place the control of the schools under Catholic rate-payers, and not under the ecclesiastical authorities. The clergy have only so much to do with the schools as the Catholic people are willing to accord to them. Protestant ministers are not prevented from being school inspectors, teachers, or trustees, and the Empire may rest assured that the Catholics of Ontario will not submit to have disabilities imposed upon their clergy. What we want is more energy on the part of Catholic school supporters towards rendering our schools efficient, and less interference from enemies and false friends.

A THEISTIC IMPERTINENCE.

The Free Press said in last Saturday's issue: "Archbishop Cleary, who is known for the violence and indecency of his language, has taken an opportunity to assail Mr. Meredith once more, this time not by letter but in public."

Whatever may have been said or written by his opponents about its violence, it is the first time we have heard of Archbishop Cleary being accused of "indecency" of language. Indeed it would require all the combined ingenuity of the writers of the Free Press and of the many unscrupulous orators of the Equal Rights Party to prove so grave a charge against anything that has appeared in print from the eloquent and classic pen of His Grace of Kingston. It is true that he proved to an admiring public the utter "indecency" of Mr. Meredith's uncalculated attack on His Grace in the famous London pronouncement. It is true also that the Archbishop once called attention, though not in the language ascribed to him, to the indecency of certain thoughtless young women attending the High Schools. But His Grace was never before accused of indecency of language. That unjust and libellous accusation was reserved for the London Free Press, which of all other journals has of late been anything but decent or truthful in its bigoted and glib attacks against the Catholic hierarchy and the Catholic Separate schools of this Province. Some time ago it told its readers, what was utterly false, viz, that Protestant tenants of Catholic property were compelled by law to pay school taxes to the Catholic Separate school fund. Last week it said that those schools were a curse to the country, and that there is a general outcry for their extinction. Whatever Archbishop Cleary has said about Mr. Meredith and his (Meredith's) public denunciation of Mr. Mowat for having crippled the Catholic schools and impaired their growth, His Grace has never uttered one word or written a line that was not consonant with God's truth; and it is illic to become a bigoted pedagogue to brand with "indecency" the manly, outspoken but truthful philosophies that have placed Archbishop Cleary's name in the foremost rank of polemical writers, and thrown confusion into the camp of the hungry bigots who, for office sake, and with a view to filthy lucre, are appealing all over the country to the religious and race prejudices of the uneducated masses while rousing and exciting the worst passions that degrade our poor humanity.

The Free Press continues:

"But Archbishop Cleary may as well understand that the people of Ontario, taken as a whole, and excepting those that have not as yet risen to the level attained in Italy and France, and in the republics of South America, care not a jot for his denunciations, and that all his rash talk as to the 'standard of the devil' being planted here, is simply laughed at."

The Free Press is grieved no doubt that some simple-minded people of Ontario have not yet risen to the level of France or Italy, in that they have not yet expunged the name of God from the text books of the Common schools, or appealed to the dagger as in the assassination of Garcia Moreno, or to the poisoned chalice as in the sacrilegious murder of the Archbishop of Quito in South America, while in the act of celebrating Mass. And, thank Heaven, our Canadian Protestant fellow-citizens, although somewhat bigoted, have not as yet reached that point, and we hope they never shall. But the devil's standard being planted right here in our midst is not a thing to be laughed at. That bloody standard was planted in France after the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1769, and the youth of the country were handed over to the infidel teachings of Voltaire and Diderot. The result was the bloodiest revolution that ever disgraced the annals of history and the expulsion of Christianity from that fair country which it became an act of high treason against the State to believe in God. The Free Press may laugh at the "devil's standard" being planted anywhere, for leading articles for some time back on school questions, the divorce law and other abominations go very far in proving the writers in the Free Press do not believe either in God or the devil; but Archbishop and all good Catholics as well as every sincere Protestant in the country

firmly believe in God and the devil, and the Free Press is well aware that the school laws place the control of the schools under Catholic rate-payers, and not under the ecclesiastical authorities. The clergy have only so much to do with the schools as the Catholic people are willing to accord to them. Protestant ministers are not prevented from being school inspectors, teachers, or trustees, and the Empire may rest assured that the Catholics of Ontario will not submit to have disabilities imposed upon their clergy. What we want is more energy on the part of Catholic school supporters towards rendering our schools efficient, and less interference from enemies and false friends.

A THEISTIC IMPERTINENCE.

The Free Press said in last Saturday's issue: "Archbishop Cleary, who is known for the violence and indecency of his language, has taken an opportunity to assail Mr. Meredith once more, this time not by letter but in public."

Whatever may have been said or written by his opponents about its violence, it is the first time we have heard of Archbishop Cleary being accused of "indecency" of language. Indeed it would require all the combined ingenuity of the writers of the Free Press and of the many unscrupulous orators of the Equal Rights Party to prove so grave a charge against anything that has appeared in print from the eloquent and classic pen of His Grace of Kingston. It is true that he proved to an admiring public the utter "indecency" of Mr. Meredith's uncalculated attack on His Grace in the famous London pronouncement. It is true also that the Archbishop once called attention, though not in the language ascribed to him, to the indecency of certain thoughtless young women attending the High Schools. But His Grace was never before accused of indecency of language. That unjust and libellous accusation was reserved for the London Free Press, which of all other journals has of late been anything but decent or truthful in its bigoted and glib attacks against the Catholic hierarchy and the Catholic Separate schools of this Province. Some time ago it told its readers, what was utterly false, viz, that Protestant tenants of Catholic property were compelled by law to pay school taxes to the Catholic Separate school fund. Last week it said that those schools were a curse to the country, and that there is a general outcry for their extinction. Whatever Archbishop Cleary has said about Mr. Meredith and his (Meredith's) public denunciation of Mr. Mowat for having crippled the Catholic schools and impaired their growth, His Grace has never uttered one word or written a line that was not consonant with God's truth; and it is illic to become a bigoted pedagogue to brand with "indecency" the manly, outspoken but truthful philosophies that have placed Archbishop Cleary's name in the foremost rank of polemical writers, and thrown confusion into the camp of the hungry bigots who, for office sake, and with a view to filthy lucre, are appealing all over the country to the religious and race prejudices of the uneducated masses while rousing and exciting the worst passions that degrade our poor humanity.

The Free Press continues:

"But Archbishop Cleary may as well understand that the people of Ontario, taken as a whole, and excepting those that have not as yet risen to the level attained in Italy and France, and in the republics of South America, care not a jot for his denunciations, and that all his rash talk as to the 'standard of the devil' being planted here, is simply laughed at."

The Free Press is grieved no doubt that some simple-minded people of Ontario have not yet risen to the level of France or Italy, in that they have not yet expunged the name of God from the text books of the Common schools, or appealed to the dagger as in the assassination of Garcia Moreno, or to the poisoned chalice as in the sacrilegious murder of the Archbishop of Quito in South America, while in the act of celebrating Mass. And, thank Heaven, our Canadian Protestant fellow-citizens, although somewhat bigoted, have not as yet reached that point, and we hope they never shall. But the devil's standard being planted right here in our midst is not a thing to be laughed at. That bloody standard was planted in France after the expulsion of the Jesuits in 1769, and the youth of the country were handed over to the infidel teachings of Voltaire and Diderot. The result was the bloodiest revolution that ever disgraced the annals of history and the expulsion of Christianity from that fair country which it became an act of high treason against the State to believe in God. The Free Press may laugh at the "devil's standard" being planted anywhere, for leading articles for some time back on school questions, the divorce law and other abominations go very far in proving the writers in the Free Press do not believe either in God or the devil; but Archbishop and all good Catholics as well as every sincere Protestant in the country

firmly believe in God and the devil, and the Free Press is well aware that the school laws place the control of the schools under Catholic rate-payers, and not under the ecclesiastical authorities. The clergy have only so much to do with the schools as the Catholic people are willing to accord to them. Protestant ministers are not prevented from being school inspectors, teachers, or trustees, and the Empire may rest assured that the Catholics of Ontario will not submit to have disabilities imposed upon their clergy. What we want is more energy on the part of Catholic school supporters towards rendering our schools efficient, and less interference from enemies and false friends.

A THEISTIC IMPERTINENCE.

The Free Press said in last Saturday's issue: "Archbishop Cleary, who is known for the violence and indecency of his language, has taken an opportunity to assail Mr. Meredith once more, this time not by letter but in public."

Whatever may have been said or written by his opponents about its violence, it is the first time we have heard of Archbishop Cleary being accused of "indecency" of language. Indeed it would require all the combined ingenuity of the writers of the Free Press and of the many unscrupulous orators of the Equal Rights Party to prove so grave a charge against anything that has appeared in print from the eloquent and classic pen of His Grace of Kingston. It is true that he proved to an admiring public the utter "indecency" of Mr. Meredith's uncalculated attack on His Grace in the famous London pronouncement. It is true also that the Archbishop once called attention, though not in the language ascribed to him, to the indecency of certain thoughtless young women attending the High Schools. But His Grace was never before accused of indecency of language. That unjust and libellous accusation was reserved for the London Free Press, which of all other journals has of late been anything but decent or truthful in its bigoted and glib attacks against the Catholic hierarchy and the Catholic Separate schools of this Province. Some time ago it told its readers, what was utterly false, viz, that Protestant tenants of Catholic property were compelled by law to pay school taxes to the Catholic Separate school fund. Last week it said that those schools were a curse to the country, and that there is a general outcry for their extinction. Whatever Archbishop Cleary has said about Mr. Meredith and his (Meredith's) public denunciation of Mr. Mowat for having crippled the Catholic schools and impaired their growth, His Grace has never uttered one word or written a line that was not consonant with God's truth; and it is illic to become a bigoted pedagogue to brand with "indecency" the manly, outspoken but truthful philosophies that have placed Archbishop Cleary's name in the foremost rank of polemical writers, and thrown confusion into the camp of the hungry bigots who, for office sake, and with a view to filthy lucre, are appealing all over the country to the religious and race prejudices of the uneducated masses while rousing and exciting the worst passions that degrade our poor humanity.

The Free Press continues:

"But Archbishop Cleary may