

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidelity."
REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY,
THOMAS COFFEY.

Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, Messrs. LUKS, KING, JOHN NICHOL and P. J. NEVILL are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the Catholic Record.

Agents for Alexandria, Glenora and Lehigh—Mr. Donald A. McDonald.
Editor of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion.

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

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

Advertisements 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.

London, Sat., Jan. 18th, 1890.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF KINGSTON AND MR. W. R. MEREDITH.

The last letter written by Mr. W. R. Meredith in his controversy with the Most Reverend Dr. Cleary, Archbishop of Kingston, was as full as any other of the series, and throughout the controversy the former gentleman refused to apologize for or retract the impudent assertion on which he based his call upon the Protestants to unite against the common enemy, the Catholics of Ontario.

That impudent assertion is that His Grace the Archbishop of Kingston was responsible for a newspaper article which he had never seen; an article which, though by no means a pronouncement of the Catholics of Canada, was yet no more condemnatory than scores of articles which had previously appeared in leading Protestant journals in regard to union among Protestants, and recommending for Catholics a policy very similar to that which is still advocated by Protestant divines who have undertaken the herculean task of crushing out of the Dominion Romanism and especially Jesuitism.

Was it not for this purpose that the seemingly formidable Equal Rights Convention was held in Toronto Opera House in June last? Was it not for this that the Anglican and Presbyterian synods and Methodist Conferences, the Ministerial Association and Orange lodges passed resolutions both in Ontario and Quebec to force a certain policy on the Dominion Government? And did not the Quebec Ministerial Association expressly endeavor to influence the electors of St. Andrew to defeat Hon. J. C. Calby, because he had spoken fairly and favorably of his French-Canadian fellow-citizens? Why has Mr. Meredith not denounced these pronouncements as violently as he has done the casual remark of one Catholic newspaper?

But it was not even for purposes of aggression on that the Canadian Freeman recommended union among Catholics. It was for the purpose of resisting the attacks which were threatened by those who asked for union among Protestants to wrest from Catholics their dearest rights. Yet, with Mr. Meredith, the whole anti-Catholic element in the Province violently denounce the proposal as dangerous to the peace and welfare of the community, though Catholics form but a small minority, while they call upon Protestants, the vast majority, to unite against us in order to deprive us of certain rights which we now enjoy, and which are really necessary for the proper working of the separate school system.

The fact is, with Mr. Meredith and his associates, the crime of union is a crime only when it is committed by Catholics for defence, but it is a virtue if committed by Equal Rightists and other Protestants whom he can lure into his policy of aggression.

Mr. Meredith knows well that His Grace the Archbishop has told him, that there is no "solid compact" of Catholics to bring wrongful concessions from one party or the other. There is no "solid compact" for any political, or politico-religious object whatsoever; and yet if Mr. Meredith's party think proper to make an onslaught which proposes to destroy rights and liberties which we value more than life itself, he need not be surprised if his course compel Catholics generally to resist him. Catholics are taxed equally with other citizens, and why should they not, as well as other citizens, use their franchise in defence of their rights? They will certainly do so, in spite of Mr. Meredith's threats. Yet we say there is no foundation for the Mail's oft-repeated falsehood, which Mr. Meredith has adopted, that the Catholics of the country have their vote for sale to be knocked down to the highest bidder. We are as interested as Protestants are in the welfare of the country, and if we feel convinced that it is best for the country that the rising generation shall have the benefit of a religious and moral training, and especially that our own children should have

such a training, we have the right to advocate our views, and to act upon our opinion at the polls. We form over 42 per cent. of the population of the Dominion, and it would be a mockery to call ours a free or a constitutional Government if our liberties, or even our prejudices, were entirely ignored. But they shall not be, as long as our manly assertion of them will aid us in their preservation.

Mr. Meredith has himself discovered that he made a blunder, and this is why in his last letter he endeavors to make it appear that his advice to the Protestants was conditional on the supposition that Catholics were "a compact minority dictating its terms as the price of its support" to either political party. It was not conditional. He assumed that Catholics were taking this position, which is false, and his advice to Protestants was absolute.

But Mr. Meredith strongly insists still that it is the duty of the Archbishop to denounce the language of the Canadian Freeman. This is the only point on which the former gentleman finds he has a loop-hole for escape from the close quarters within which His Grace has brought him; and all the press which barks with Mr. Meredith insists upon the same thing.

Why should the Archbishop denounce the Canadian Freeman? He has never adopted it as his organ, and it stands upon the same footing as other papers in the land. His Grace tells Mr. Meredith that newspapers do not ask his approval before publishing what they think well of, and that "what appears in a newspaper does not require my permission to remain before the public. It may remain till tomorrow if it awaits my permission to remain, or the remotest interference on my part to modify, if not to withdraw it, unless perchance it be directly antagonistic to faith or morals."

The position of His Grace is unsatisfactory, and it is sustained by a most masterly argument, such that even those who are unwilling to be convinced, on reading it, would not be able to resist the conviction that he has demolished the last ground on which his adversary and his followers rested. The two practical cases, one legal, and the other political, which His Grace submits for adjudication put in a clear light the impregnable position in which he stands, and the annihilation of Mr. Meredith. If Mr. Meredith is not responsible for Mr. Sol White's Annexation principles, how can Archbishop Cleary, or the whole Catholic body, be responsible for the advice given by the Freeman?

His Grace deserves the unreserved thanks of the Catholics of Ontario, especially for his last letter. It is a masterpiece of reasoning and rhetoric.

THE REREDOS MUDDLE.

The suit of the Church Association against the Bishop of London, England, to force him to remove the new reredos in St. Paul's, on the ground that a crucifix has been erected therein which has advanced a step. The Bishop had refused to consider the application of the Association to bring the matter to trial, and a mandamus was granted by the Queen's Bench ordering that a hearing should be accorded. The court of appeal has now decided that the Bishop's discretion upon such questions is absolute, provided he gave reasons for his decision, which he did; and consequently the decision of the court of Queen's Bench has been reversed. The three judges, Lord Esher and Lords Justices Lindley and Lopes agreed in the decision. An appeal will probably be made to the House of Lords. The principle upon which the Bishop acted was a decision which had already been made in the Exeter case that a historical incident from the life of Christ may lawfully be represented, and in fact the lawfulness of the representation of the Blessed Virgin holding in her arms the infant Jesus was the precise question which was settled in the Exeter case, as it was one of the representations objected to in the present instance. The other figures objected to now was that of our Lord upon the cross, and the objectors stated that both sculptures tend to encourage ideas and devotions of a superstitious kind.

The Bishop decided that both sculptures are equally lawful on the principle above stated, and that though litigation is sometimes necessary to settle questions of great importance, to settle would be useless and hurtful in this case, especially as both objections were fully met by the Exeter decision.

From the whole proceedings some interesting points are deserving of attention. In the first place, we notice the complete supremacy exercised by the civil courts over the doctrines of the Church. It is acknowledged that a doctrinal question is here at stake, since the objection was that statues, statues and devotions are encouraged by the sculptures. The judges are civil officials, and the fact that now there are four judges on the Bishop's side and only two against him settles the matter. It is true that the House of Lords may yet

reach another decision, but this a tribunal as purely civil as the bench of judges; and composed as it is of judges whose religious faith as well as whose moral character are of every imaginable mould, it is a queer commentary on the claim of the Church of England to be the true Church of Christ, that doctrinal decisions are to be finally decided, not by the successors of the Apostles, to whom Christ gave the commission to teach his doctrine, but by such civil judges as we have indicated. How this state of affairs is to be reconciled with the words of Christ, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's," we fall to see.

A second incongruity lies in the fact that while the civil power claims and possesses the supreme authority in such doctrinal matters, nevertheless it acknowledges that in the present instance it has abrogated its right, and leaves the matter in the hands of individual Bishops to entirely that it really cannot interfere without new legislation on the subject, legislation which is not likely to be ever passed through Parliament; for the decision is, in the words of Baron Pollock, that "so long as the Bishop assigned his reasons in accordance with the Act, no temporal Court had any authority to interfere."

This leaves it in the power of every Bishop to have, practically, a Church of his own in his diocese, with its own distinctive doctrines. This is the muddled authority which has been substituted for the Supreme Court of the Catholic Church, the See of Peter, which is obeyed throughout the world. What kind of unity, either in doctrine or discipline, can be expected on such principles of Church authority?

Lastly: under such a regime we cease to wonder at the opposition which was offered by the Church of England in Montreal to the erection of a statue of the Blessed Virgin in the park. It was there officially declared by the authorities of the Church, in union with the clergy of other Protestant denominations, that the erection of such a statue would encourage superstitious devotion. The decision in the Bishop of London's case is that such an erection is not superstitious in London; but since the superstitiousness of the matter is made to dwell so entirely on the Bishop's pleasure, the surprise would be, not that there should be a different doctrine taught in Montreal, but that any two dioceses of the Church should have the same doctrine on this or any other subject. We are not surprised, therefore, that the teachings in Montreal and London should be inconsistent with each other.

And yet Canadian Presbyterianism, which declares all such statues to be "monuments of idolatry," favors some kind of a corporate union with the Church of England, which will solemnly ratify both the use and prohibition of these "monuments," according to Episcopal whim.

Verily we can imagine we hear John Knox groaning in his grave at the contemplation of impending sacrilege.

There is great rejoicing in the camp of the Ritualists on account of the decision of the court, and corresponding disappointment among the Low Church party, but as far as we can see there is no great reason for congratulation on the part of the former, whereas it is merely shown that the matter is one completely under the control of individuals. If Dr. Temple's sympathies had been "Evangelical" the decision would have been the other way, and it would have had the same force. It is remarkable, too, that his sympathies should tend towards Ritualism, since shortly before his nomination to the episcopate he was one of those Anglican clergymen who created such intense excitement by the publication of the "Essays and Reviews," whose open Latitudinarianism, coming from such a quarter, astounded the world. Ritualism must be making great strides when it has gained over as many adherents even from the circle in which Bishop Temple formerly moved. Notwithstanding the vigorous opposition of the evangelicals, the tide of Ritualism, it seems, is not to be blocked out with dykes.

According to Mr. Mercier the Quebec finances are in a prosperous condition, and there is a surplus for the year 1888-89. There was a surplus also the preceding year. As usual, the Mail takes the occasion to picture a prospect of ruin and bankruptcy to the Province, and tells the people of Quebec once more that the people of Quebec are sure to make a raid upon the Dominion treasury. It declares that the Catholics are hanging to be supported by Protestant money. It need scarcely be uneasy on this point, for it is only from the Protestant part of the population that the clamor comes to get money from the Catholics for the education of their children in this Province, and as far as Quebec is concerned, that Province is not demanding any Dominion money or aid. It is managing its own affairs, and Ontario would do well to attend to its own business also. Since the Mail's lugubrious prognostications began, the only attempt made upon the Dominion for better terms has come from a Protestant Province.

THE EFFICIENCY OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS.

Ingersoll affords us another proof, which we are happy to record of the efficiency of the separate schools of the Province. At the late high school entrance examinations a separate school pupil, Theresa Comiskey, gained the highest number of points awarded to any pupil of the town, viz., 440. The second place was gained by a public school pupil, A. Toul, 431, and the third was attained equally by one public school and one separate school pupil, 424 points each. There were ten pupils of the Ingersoll public schools successful at this examination and two separate school pupils; but as the Catholic population is less than 13 per cent. of the population of the town, a decided victory must be scored in favor of the Catholic School, which had 103 per cent. in the number of pupils passed. Judged by the points gained, the success of the Catholic schools is still greater, reaching nearly 221 per cent. The number of points scored by the 10 successful public school pupils was 3861, and by those of the separate school 864. Sister Ambrosia is the teacher to whom this result is mainly due.

We last week recorded a similar success achieved by the separate school in Goderich, from which four pupils passed the examination successfully, one of these also obtaining the highest number of marks of any pupil of the town and neighboring townships. We would be happy to hear of the results of these competitive examinations in different parts of the Province, especially while the enemies of Catholic education are boasting so loudly of the undeniable superiority of the public schools; and in every case sufficient data should be furnished to enable us to institute a comparison.

A few days ago the Mail announced with a great flourish that the public schools of Kingston had shown a marked superiority over the separate schools, the former passing fifty-two candidates, whereas the latter had only succeeded in passing one. The truth is that in the separate schools of that city the higher branches of forms five and six are taught, so that it very rarely occurs that the pupils present themselves at all to compete at the entrance examination, and even when they do they go on their own responsibility, as they have their own promotion examinations, and the Brothers have no reason to prepare their pupils for the entrance examination. When the boys do present themselves, it is usually merely to ascertain in isolated cases their individual proficiency, and in nearly all cases, when they pass, they return to the Brothers' schools to continue their course. There was, therefore, no competition between the public and separate schools on this occasion, and there were no data for a comparison of their efficiency. With its usual unfairness the Mail represents that the reason why Catholic pupils do not compete is that the schools use inferior books. There is no foundation for this statement.

We have had frequent occasion to record local successes achieved by the separate schools; but we have not data for any general comparison. We object, however, to a comparison founded upon a case like that of Kingston where there was no competition whatsoever.

We cannot close our remarks on this subject without referring to some other matters having a close connection with it. A recent number of the Daily News also makes allusion to the supposed inferiority of separate schools, as if it were a certain fact. We have before now shown from the educational returns of the Province that as far as the figures go, the separate schools manifest superiority in almost every respect. We will not here reproduce those figures, but we will state that it should be the aim of our Protestant fellow citizens to encourage us to make them efficient, instead of endeavoring to throw obstacles in our way, as is the purpose of Mr. Meredith and the pretended Equal Rights faction. But what should we think of Catholics who would endeavor to impair their efficiency by persuading other Catholics to withdraw support from them and to transfer it to the public schools? It is needless for us to say that we cannot find words strong enough to express the baseness of such malignity, if it existed. The laws already highly favor the public schools, and "our friends the enemy" are clamoring for additional enactments which will enable them to siphon from unwary Catholics every half dollar which they can by any dishonest contrivance divert from its proper channel, the education of their own children, so that it may be applied to that of their Protestant neighbors' children. This is mean enough in all conscience, but for Catholics to help them in this work, would be not only dishonest, but also despicably traitorous. We cannot recall to mind without commiseration the intensity of King James the Second's agony when he exclaimed, on the occasion of his second daughter's flight to ride armed at the head of a body of cavalry, which was marching to dethrone him: "God help me! my own children desert me," but the Princess Anne had at least joined the side of

William III. because she favored the Protestant cause, in which both her sister and husband were enlisted and perhaps through conscientious motives.

The Catholics to whom we have referred above would have no such excuse as this.

We speak thus strongly of what is but a hypothetical case, yet we have known individuals who have acted thus basely; and the News of the 6th inst. stated it as an almost certain fact that owing to the disappointment of Mr. D. P. Cahill, because the Toronto school elections did not result as he desired, he intends at once to begin the same work through the medium of the City Clerk's office. Mr. Cahill in a later issue of the same paper denies entirely that he had any such intention, giving the following reasons:

"Such a course would be suicidal. It would be fatal to the best interests of our separate school system. It would enable the reactionary element at present in power to say, with truth, what they have all along asserted falsely, that the end we have in view is the abolition of separate schools, etc."

We are well aware that the efforts of any one who would attempt such a movement would be disastrous, but we firmly believe that the disaster would recoil upon himself, and could not fall upon the separate schools. The Catholic people are loyal to Catholic schools, and could not be induced to endeavor to make them inefficient. Those who would make such an attempt, as the News attributed to Mr. Cahill, would therefore fail miserably, and would succeed only in making themselves ridiculous, as well as proving themselves traitors, and bringing upon themselves the deserved censure of their co-religionists.

We cannot conceive that any Protestant would lend himself to a similar effort to destroy Protestant schools as such, even if the law made it possible for him to do so. We should blush to find that any Catholic were so lost to shame as to follow such a course, and we are pleased to find that the intention was wrongly attributed to Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Cahill takes occasion in his letter to the News to lay down a platform which the advocates of ballot in Toronto propose to carry out. We may hereafter refer to some of these points.

MEDIEVALISM IN QUEBEC.

The usual and constant cry of the fanatics in Ontario is that the French in Quebec are behind the age. The Toronto Mail especially is forever and ceaselessly writing them down as sunk in medievalism. By this it means that the French-Canadians are at least four hundred years behind the times, and that they are irretrievably sunk in the darkness of the middle ages. Of course, with a little daylight thrown upon the pages of history, it would be found that what Protestants are pleased to designate as the "dark ages" were what true historians call the "Ages of Faith"—that is, the ages of true light, which enlightens every man that cometh into this world. These were the ages that saw the foundation and completion of all the great universities. The celebrated, and, for extensive learning and piety, famed Colleges of Padua, of Cordova, of Salamanca, Paris and Oxford, and many others, were all founded and endowed and made famous during those ages. All the grand cathedrals of Europe were built in those ages, and such was the knowledge of architectural science and of artistic beauty and of moral solidity in those great ages that the structures then erected still stand erect in all their solidity and freshness of art decorative; that no such edifices can now be erected because there is neither science, nor genius, nor poetry, nor statuary, nor painting, nor harmony, to be found in our age of dollars, and surface, and humbug, that may for a moment stand comparison with the glories that halloved and made memorable the names and the memory of the men of faith and self denial who lived in the ages of faith, or what Protestants seem to delight in calling, the dark ages, or, again, medievalism. The French-Canadians, fortunately for themselves and for civilization, have preserved the grand old simple faith of their illustrious and sainted ancestors. They love their Church; respect and revere the priests of God who minister to them; they keep Lent and Advent; honor the Mother of God and pray to her; tell their daughters to imitate her angelic virtues; they abhor divorce, cheating, lying and every other villainy of modern times, and therefore they are classed as clericalists and as sunk in medievalism. It would be well for society if the readers and supporters of the Mail were, but trained as the French-Canadians, to honor God by their deeds more than by their words, to call His Mother blessed, to honor the saints and walk in their footsteps. There certainly would exist as a natural result more charity and less pride and bombast; there would be more toleration and less fanaticism; more love of truth and less stolid ignorance. Another result would flow from it: they would be less easily imposed on by every mountebank and every

rafter who comes the way, and better able to resist such frantic appeals to prejudice and passion as are made week after week and day after day by such unscrupulous sheets as the Mail and cognate firebrands of the press.

In proof of the unredeemable state of medievalism to which the Catholics in the sister Provinces are reduced we shall make a few quotations from the Lieutenant-Governor's speech addressed on Tuesday, January 7th, to the Quebec Legislature:

Honorable gentlemen of the Legislative Council—Gentlemen of the Legislative Assembly—I extend to you a cordial welcome to these legislative halls in which you are to discuss matters of the highest interest to this country, and tender to you at the commencement of the New Year my best wishes for your happiness and for the happiness and prosperity of your families and of all the people of this Province whom you represent. . . . My Government consider it wise and necessary to encourage night schools, and you will be asked to vote a special grant for that purpose for the cities of Montreal and Quebec.

The necessity of improving the roads in the country has induced my Government to further encourage the raising of our public roads and you will be asked to vote an appropriation for that purpose as an experiment.

To these two items of the Lieutenant-Governor's speech we will confine our remarks. Does it look like living in the "Dark Ages" to make legislative provision for night schools? How many young men are there who either had no opportunity when children of being educated, or who, having opportunities, neglected them, and now see the mistake they made and tell us what they would do if they but got the chance? They are now learning a trade or are employed every hour of the day. The night school is their only remedy—their only means of ever rising above the common level of the plodding journeyman. This remedy Mr. Mercier's medieval Government has provided for them, at least in the cities as an experiment. Once the night schools are an established success they shall be introduced into every town and village. Does this kind of legislation look very much like keeping people in the dark? What has been done in this connection by the Ontario Legislature? Has any such move been ever made? Which of the two Provinces deserves being classed with the dark ages?

Macadamizing or stoning the public highways, and thus doing away with the toll gate and turnpike nuisance, is a step in advance of Ontario's legislation. Our enlightened government leaves it to the township or county councils to buy up the charters of road companies there is no other mode of redress. The road companies, no matter how unpopular or how the people exclaim against them, hold on to their privilege of charging heavy tolls. These privileges or chartered rights the township councils are not able and the county councils are unwilling to purchase. So that it does not seem possible that for another century the people of Ontario shall be able to shake off this incubus of medievalism? In all the flat lands and clay soils the roads in Ontario are execrable. In the county of Essex, for instance, and in several portions of the neighboring county of Kent, the public roads are well nigh impassable, and perfectly useless. The old colonial system of statute labor is still in vogue all through this Province. Every one acquainted with country life and manners must acknowledge that it is as irksome as it is unproductive, and that for all the labor expended on these roads by the vicinal farmers very little is accomplished beyond rendering them passable at certain seasons of the year. In Great Britain and Ireland a slight tax is imposed; it is called the county cess, and left in the hands of the County Treasurer. With this sum all the highways are kept in the highest state of repair, contracts are let and a County Inspector or his agents must travel over every inch of the road twice a year and certify to the fulfillment of each and every piece of road work contracted for. The same enlightened and satisfactory system is now being adopted in the Province of Quebec. Toll gates and turnpikes are abolished, and the public roads are to be kept in perfect order by legislative enactments and provisions that are not even dreamt of or, if considered, dare not be attempted in Ontario. But all that we may write or say on the subject shall have no weight with the Mail and the fanatics, Goldwin Smith, and the other prominent leaders of Protestant thought who still continue to bound down the French-Canadians as being sunk in barbarism, subject to priestly control and away behind the age in every modern improvement. Their improvements in school and public highway legislation are far in advance of anything yet contemplated in this enlightened Province.

Never in history was a fairer test given of the difference between Protestant and Catholic legislation than may be witnessed henceforth as enacted in Toronto and Quebec. Catholic influence and leadership will have full

expression in every mountebank and every

expression in every mountebank and every

expression in every mountebank and every

expression in every mountebank and every

trol under the able and conscientious management of Honore Mercier, who is a true son of the Church. And we have no hesitation in predicting that under him the charge of medievalism made against Quebec Province will fall to the ground or rather fall back with full justice and merit on the heads of the Elizabethan brawlers and Cromwellian Gossippers, who would renew the penal code, and set back for another century enlightened civilization in the Province of Ontario.

AN UNREASONING CRITIC.

The Montreal Witness, in which Mr. Joly's letter on the Jesuits' Estates Act appeared, has a most able condemnation of the honorable gentleman's views. It says that the Act "rehabilitates a foe of all governments." But this is precisely the light in which a really Catholic nation will not regard the Jesuits. It was not to be expected, therefore, that the Lower Canadian Legislature would do so, even though an immoral king of France took revenge on them by having them expelled the country because they rebuked his immorality, and though later an infidel Republican government represented them as plotters, because they are zealous for the Catholic religion.

The Witness also reiterates that the importation of the Pope's name into the Act acknowledges in the Pope an authority which he ought not to have. Mr. Joly's letter answers this objection admirably; and in fact there is no proof advanced by the Witness against Mr. Joly's reason for furthering than a mere contradiction: "You say yes, but we say no." This is not an answer to an able argument.

Again the Witness repeats the effect objection that the Jesuits will make new demands upon the Province. This is also satisfactorily set at rest by Mr. Joly. The Witness evidently could not answer the ex-Premier.

HIGH TREASON.

The Toronto Mail has been accused of high treason by the Toronto Empire and the Globe. "We have now," says the Empire, "a startling disclosure of the recent efforts of the Mail to aid in a treasonable conspiracy. Facts of the gravest importance have been disclosed as showing the traitorous alliance of our domestic enemies with the foreign coveters of our land." The facts are that the chief editor of the Mail, Mr. Farrar, has been on a prolonged visit to Washington on a special mission, interviewing Mr. Blaine and spending a large portion of his time with Mr. Hoar, disclosing to him the weak points of Canada's defence and the general state of feeling among Canadians about annexation with the United States. The Mail denies the imputation, declaring that some of its staff editors merely went to Washington on a holiday excursion.

The Toronto Globe's correspondent, however, unearths much of the mischief done by Mr. Farrar to Canadian interests during his sojourn at Washington. "A more outrageous plot," it says, "to prevent an amicable settlement between the two countries, to mar the favorable prospects of reciprocity and to further annexation schemes, cannot be conceived." We had proofs enough before to-day of the Toronto Mail's treachery to Canadian interests and prosperity. Its incessant efforts to stir up civil and religious warfare in Ontario—its attempt at discrediting the Province of Quebec—its labored efforts to incite peaceful citizens to distrust each other, to encourage fanaticism and hatred of the Catholic Church—its columns ever open to the most unjust and most infamous personal attacks on the sacred persons of our revered archbishops and bishops—all this is well known to a disgusted public, both Catholic and Protestant. The friends of order, of peace, and of harmonious relations between fellow-men—the friends of progress and true civilization, could at all times see through the hollowness and the unreliability of the Mail's professions of loyalty and liberality of views—but after the startling disclosures which have come to light about its secret plottings against its country's interests and very life, the entire Canadian public must acknowledge their simplicity in having so long allowed themselves to be duped and befooled by the blatant semi-savage leading articles that have appeared in the Toronto Mail for the last three years.

The discovery of the Toronto Mail's plotting in Washington must have one good result at least: That of enlightening the ignorant masses as to its sincerity in its fierce onslaughts upon the Jesuits and Ultramontanians. This anti-Catholic crusade was merely intended to throw dust in the eyes of the people, while preparing the way for discontent, civil strife and the disruption of our Canadian autonomy and self government. Fortunately the discovery was made in time to arrest all the evils it intended. The country must breathe more freely and unadulterated bigotry receive its quietus.

The discovery of the Toronto Mail's plotting in Washington must have one good result at least: That of enlightening the ignorant masses as to its sincerity in its fierce onslaughts upon the Jesuits and Ultramontanians. This anti-Catholic crusade was merely intended to throw dust in the eyes of the people, while preparing the way for discontent, civil strife and the disruption of our Canadian autonomy and self government. Fortunately the discovery was made in time to arrest all the evils it intended. The country must breathe more freely and unadulterated bigotry receive its quietus.

The discovery of the Toronto Mail's plotting in Washington must have one good result at least: That of enlightening the ignorant masses as to its sincerity in its fierce onslaughts upon the Jesuits and Ultramontanians. This anti-Catholic crusade was merely intended to throw dust in the eyes of the people, while preparing the way for discontent, civil strife and the disruption of our Canadian autonomy and self government. Fortunately the discovery was made in time to arrest all the evils it intended. The country must breathe more freely and unadulterated bigotry receive its quietus.