

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT
300 BROADWAY, ST. LOUIS, MO.

REV. JOHN P. COFFEY, M.A., LL.D., EDITOR
TOLSON, 1077 N. 7th ST. ST. LOUIS, MO.

GENERAL AGENTS:
Messrs. Donat Crowe and Luke King.
OTTAWA AGENTS:

P. J. Coffey, General Agent, 74 George St.
BATES PER ANNUM.—One copy, \$2.00;
Five copies, \$10.00; Ten copies, \$18.00. Pay-
able in advance.

Rate of Advertising.—Ten cents per line
each insertion.

Approved by the Bishop of London, and
recommended by the Archbishop of St.
Pauline, the Bishops of Ottawa, Hamilton,
Kingston, and P. J. O'Rourke, and leading Cath-
olic Clergymen throughout the Dominion.

All correspondence addressed to the Pub-
lisher will receive prompt attention.

Advertisements must be paid in full before the
work can be started.

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

Catholic Record.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JULY 24, 1886.

CALENDAR FOR JULY.

CONSECATED TO ST. ANNE, MOTHER OF
THE B. V. M.

- 22d Ap. Virgin's Bp. and Martyr.
- 23d Vigil of St. James, St. Christina, Virgin
and d.
- 24th Sunday in P. n. St. James the Greater,
Ap. St. Christopher, M.
- 25th Anna, Mother of the B. V. M.
- 26th Pauline, Martyr.
- 27th St. Ignace and Comp. s., M. and C.
- 28th St. Ignace and Comp. s., M. and C.
- 29th St. Ignace and Comp. s., M. and C.
- 30th St. Ignace and Comp. s., M. and C.
- 31st St. Ignace and Comp. s., M. and C.

LEO XIII AND FRANCE.

Le Moniteur de Rome, of the 13th of June, says that in the consistory held on the previous Monday, the Holy Father treated some of the grave problems that excite the public mind. It was altogether an intimate allocution, wherein Leo XIII. opened his heart of pastor and father. France, the most privileged of the countries then favored by the selection of members of her hierarchy for places in the Sacred College of Cardinals—received first mention from the Sovereign Pontiff, who eulogized that generous nation, which, despite the excesses of official radicalism, remains honorable through its lively faith and its unbounded devotion to the Church and to the Papacy. The words of the Holy Father pronounced at the Consistory will, thinks *Le Moniteur*, hold place in the history of the Vatican's relations with old Gaul, side by side with the admirable encyclical *Nobilissima Gallorum gens*. It was indeed a most interesting work, the tracing of the historic interpenetration of France and the Papacy through the labyrinth of time, from the day on which Charlemagne came to bend before the majesty of the pontifical tiara, till that in this present year of grace, in which Leo XIII. made France the gift of three cardinals. For centuries France was, among the civilized nations of the earth, at the apex of which at one time equally revered and yielded obedience to Rome, the foremost protector and guardian of the Holy See. This brilliant nation has long taken the lead in all works of faith and Catholic chivalry. It is she that first established the now world-wide Peter's Pence for the honorable sustentation of the First Pastor of the Church—she who provided and still provides resources for the missions—she who founded the schools of the East—she who has endowed the Propaganda with richest gifts—she who, in the incomparable hierarchy of Catholic charity, has long held the first, and for a time the only place. In every domain of that charity she has proven herself the great and fecund initiator. This is her regal crown, her providential privilege, the seal of God set upon her. And now, when her resolute example has borne fruit in drawing even the remotest peoples into works of faith and of devotion to the Holy See—when she sees even the youngest nations rivaling her in generosity and fidelity—she holds none the less by the chivalrous traditions of her heroic past. Of her it may be said: *Semper et ubique fidelis*. The Holy Father had good cause for his commendation of France, for that country never fails to give the world the spectacle of good—well done. Side by side with the world of official radicalism, there is in France a greater world of believers. Behind the exterior appearance of irreligion, there is the active field of good works of every kind. France is to day, perchance, the country above all others, more seemingly in decadence, but enjoying under this false appearance the strength of great ideas and generous sentiments. It is this regrettable dualism of life which explains the contradictory judgments pronounced not alone by strangers, but by Frenchmen themselves, on this extraordinary country. Product of the revolution which has divided the social and religious life of the nation, this separation of the national soul is the greatest evil. If France is ever to regain her prestige and robustness of old, the antagonism or rather division of the various orders of her national life must cease. But whatever may be said or thought of political and administrative decadence in France, that country has a reserve of

generosity, of intellect, of force and of faith that will ever nerve and inspire her to meet all crises of her history. It is to the France of good works that the Holy Father addressed his word of commendation. He wishes to tighten the bonds which unite that generous nation with the church and Pontificate of Rome. These ties are indissoluble. Here again France has taken the lead in the marvellous movement of concentration about the Holy See. Our century has been made illustrious by the devotedness of the French Catholics to the Holy See. Who can ever forget the famous struggles of its best sons for the independence and glory of the Papal dynasty? Who can forget the eloquence, the faith and fidelity of Guéranger, Dupanloup, Pie, Falloux, Montalembert? It is Catholic France that has drawn the entire world to the feet of the successor of Peter in that vast religious concentration about the centre of unity, a concentration that is a veritable movement of the Catholic universe upon Rome. When France has done such great things, the Holy Father speaks not in vain his eulogies of her great services to Christianity.

It is our hope that Catholic France may in the near future more vigorously assert herself at home. The battle of right she must fight at the polls. Every strength of hers she should summon to drive, by the peaceful but all-powerful methods of the ballot box, her enemies, who are the enemies of the church, from the offices they disgrace. By so doing France will add new titles to those she already enjoys to the confidence and regard of the world.

THE DUTY OF THE HOUR.

Ireland is, no one can doubt it, on the eve of a crisis of pressing and gigantic magnitude. She stands on the threshold of a struggle that will try all her strength and test all her heroism. England has pronounced decisively and unmistakably—for a time only it may be—but for the time, at all events, decisively and emphatically against the concession of an Irish Parliament. The grand old man must drop from his palatial hand the seals of office, and yield his high place to Ireland's deadly foes—the Salisbury, the Hartingtons and the Churchills. These are men of class and title, not of the people, but against the people. Of Ireland they propose to make a victim, to force her into civil strife and internecine conflict. Never in Ireland's history had Irishmen at home and abroad a graver crisis to face, but face it they are sure they will, with all their manhood and their might, and their determination. Their patience will be tried, their virtues sorely tested, but of this we feel confident, that out of the struggle against class and title and hereditary antagonism, they will issue stronger and firmer in their own consideration, and in the opinion of civilized men the world over. Ireland's cause is the world's cause, the cause of the masses against despotic class, and against ancestral bondage.

The United Ireland, of Dublin, commenting on the British political situation, says: "The tricksters, soreheads and mountebanks who are about to assume office in the present tremendous crisis in English history have in common but one dominating impulse—to grab at the emoluments of power. This is indeed a grotesque sacrifice. It is as if a rascal clothed himself in the vestments of a priest for the purpose of robbing the altar." In another paragraph the same paper says: "Mr. Gladstone's opponents tragically concentrated the Belfast trades for political purposes. Murder, particular or wholesale, will not stop them any more than it did Ireland's enemies heretofore. The Marquis of Salisbury, Joseph Chamberlain and Lord Randolph Churchill are as unscrupulous as Pitt, Clare and Castlereagh, but they are punier. The slanders of the Times and Lord Hartington are as infamous as those of Lord Cornwall or General Ross. The Belfast Orangemen have been selected to goad the Irish people into violence in order to secure a pretext for coercion, with a view to stifling Ireland's demand until Gladstone shall be dead."

The Irish people have nothing but fire and sword and persecution to expect from the incoming administration, and that administration they must meet by rigid adherence to peace, by fervent devotion to order, by unceasing abstention from crime. But if the administration go beyond the limits of humanity, as Salisbury is well able to do, then Ireland, the Ireland not alone of the Emerald Isle, but the Ireland of America, must meet it with arms in her hands. As between the persecuting Tory and the savage Orangeman on the one hand, and the determined patriotic Irishman on the other, we fear not the result. Blood may flow in torrents, and innocent lives be sacrificed by the thousand, but Ireland must win. We tremble at the contemplation of such a struggle, and we have yet hopes that the cool, sober second-thought of the great English nation will not force on such an issue. It is not in England's interests nor in the world's interests that Ireland should be driven into

despair. In her despair she will be overwhelmed in her strength, restless in her might, merciless in her onslaughts on her foe. Peace we desire, for peace we pray, but if war must come, if the dictates of right and the precepts not alone of civilization, but of humanity, are set at naught, and a furious soldiery and a savage rabble let loose on an inoffensive people, Ireland will for the worst prepare herself, and, if she must perish, perish with honor.

OUR COLLEGES.

We direct attention to the advertisement, which in another column appears concerning the College of Ottawa. This institution has, as our readers are well aware, acquired in this country a reputation that from us requires no special notice. Of colleges it does indeed stand true that "by their fruits shall ye know them." The College of Ottawa has no cause to fear a close scrutiny of its record. It has done in this country a work that speaks for itself and that will, we do hope, be more and more valued as Catholic education comes to be by all Catholics held in just appreciation. There are but four Catholic colleges in the Province of Ontario, and these, we do venture to say, are not at all supported as they should be. All do a great work, and should, in the fulfilment of their mission, be readily and heartily sustained. In all of them a sound English education is imparted, the English language being, in the College of Ottawa, as in the other Upper Canadian colleges, the official language of the institution. From our knowledge of the educational wants of the Catholic people of Ontario we would say that they cannot too soon take to heart the truth that the collegiate institutions and the high schools can never give the Catholic young men of the Province anything deserving the name of education, mental or moral. Catholic men can be produced only by Catholic institutions. These reflections bring to mind an address delivered on Friday, July 1st, 1881, by Mr. H. J. Kavanagh, advocate, of Montreal, at the St. Bridge's Bazaar in that city, every word and thought and suggestion of which deserves the attention and reflection of our readers. The learned gentleman said:

"I will attempt to show you that many of the things we complain of are attributable to this need. But first let us examine and see how we are situated in this respect, whether or not there is any such want. We have schools where English is taught, it is true; whether these schools are as good as they should be is not for me at present to consider. (Remember I am speaking only of higher education, and I find that in this Province the English-speaking Catholics have no college of their own.) Now, I suppose as there is no use in denying what is only true, but manifest, that there is no harm in admitting, and that you yourselves will admit, that we do not in this Province command an influence proportionate either to our wealth or to our numbers, and why is this? Let me frankly tell you why. It is to a certain degree because we have no means of obtaining and securing for us the position that should be ours, and I fear that we shall never attain that position till we shall have been in the receipt of as high an education as our means admit of, as our other reasons for the community enjoy. If it is the right of the community to have a high education, then the importance of this branch of education, look and see with what earnestness others consider the matter. Protestants have two Universities in Lower Canada, two in Upper Canada and one in the Maritime Provinces, and they maintain them at a heavy cost, and they send their children to them and to Canada, betrays the great importance that they wisely consider attaches to the subject of higher education. But they are not alone in their wisdom. The French Canadians, besides having numerous collegiate institutions throughout the country, have two splendid colleges in this city; they are also a branch of the celebrated University of Laval, and so alive are they to their interests in this respect that they are satisfied with this they are determined to have here a University in this city of their own and separate from Laval.

We alone unfortunately consider that we do not want such things, or rather I believe we don't bother our heads about them. We are content with nothing in this respect, and yet while all the advantages of education are to be found among those whom we are competing with, we are surprised when we are worsted in the competition. We seem satisfied if those of our sons who are ambitious are allowed entry into colleges where their mother tongue is a foreign language and whence, after several years of study, they come out to take their part in the contest of life, having a mere acquaintance with French, and such knowledge only of English as their own industry at home has helped them to. And then, forsooth, the wonder is that the sons of Irishmen in Canada are often insolent in their speech, that they limp along in phrases like cripples on the road, that they are so deficient in the inheritance of eloquence that has distinguished Irishmen at home and elsewhere abroad. Of course there have been, and there are a few men among us, splendid exceptions to the rule, men who in spite of the disadvantages of an education received in French institutions, have been and are able to compare favorably with more favored men. But why should this be an exception; why should there be such a rule? Why, I ask, is it that in our courts, upon the Bench, in our legislative assemblies, English speaking Catholics are not found in numbers proportionate

to the English speaking population? Are we to be more hewers of wood and drawers of water? If I am told that we have not been able to penetrate to these places merely because of a popular prejudice that would exclude us, while I admit the existence of such a prejudice I cannot honestly accept this as sufficient explanation of the fact. I am convinced, on the contrary, that if there could be found not one or two men only, but a choice of men among us, a hundred men, who, by their learning and previous education, were fitted to lead, were qualified to administer justice, and frame laws, and fill the higher and more honorable offices of the state, that then, but not till then, would English-speaking Catholics be fairly represented on the Bench, in the Houses of Parliament and wherever else they might choose. Believe me that real merit is, in the long run, simply irresistible; there may be prejudices, but such must give way before what is irrefragable; and rest assured that, prejudices even considered, men, like water, are in the great average of cases, pretty sure to find their level, to sink if they are inferior, but to rise high if they are qualified.

But, ladies and gentlemen, I am afraid that as long as we are content with the present system of college education, we must remain precisely where we are. And not only will our young men, destined for the higher walks of life, come out of French colleges speaking imperfect or inelegant English, (for such a defect is of minor importance, and might be counterbalanced by the substantial advantages of a solid education, since it is not necessary for success in life to be gifted with either the mellifluous accent of Trinity or the classic pronunciation of Cambridge), but the worst result will be that as long as we have only French institutions of this kind there will be a great and a natural reluctance on the part of English-speaking Catholics to send their sons to college at all.

Now, I submit that the advancement of our people morally, socially and materially depends, to a very great extent, on the education of youth. And I further contend that in order to fit a man for the higher positions of life a University, or at least a college education is an essential, and has always and everywhere been so considered. Now, we are a little inconsistent; we have ambition for these high places for our rising youth, and yet we are not ready to give them the education that would fit them for them. But in our inconsistency we do not take the means to arrive at the end. I say we should; we should attend to this, and the sooner the better.

If we desire that some men of our race and creed in this mixed community should be ranked among the judges of the land, if we wish to see English-speaking Catholics holding portfolios of Cabinet Ministers and occupying seats in Parliament in fair numbers, then you must fit men for these high positions, and since it is the received opinion that the only way to prepare a man for these positions is by giving him the education to be had in good colleges, we should adopt the means that with other people have been so successful.

We have not done so up to the present; why, I am at a loss to tell. We Irish people have been always admitted to be most eager for education. Our old country was once famous for its scholars; and its scholars, in times past, ere its terrible misfortunes robbed it of every thing, Ireland was called "The School of the West." Have the descendants of Irishmen in Canada forgotten the instincts that distinguished their fathers? Perhaps it is that in the past its scholars have been innumerable difficulties in the way, and I am satisfied that if there were united action now we could succeed, and I believe that within two years we could have our Irish college in Montreal.

Mr. Kavanagh's suggestions to the Irish Catholics of the Province of Quebec may well be put before the Irish Catholics of Ontario, who in too many instances prefer the cheap training of the High School to the solid Catholic education of the College. If French Colleges are not the places for Irish Catholic boys, neither are the hybrid superficial High Schools of Ontario. Catholic parents, you have now a duty to perform, in selecting a school for your boys, that you should at every sacrifice fulfill. Our Colleges are the places for them, and our Colleges will have them if you listen to the voice of conscience. Our earnest hope and prayer is that not alone the College of Ottawa, but every Catholic College in Ontario, will be filled, at their re-opening, by Catholic boys from this "Canada of ours."

TOO SWEEPING.

The *Globe* of the 15th asks: "Do those who set fire to the buildings of such as are supporters of the Scott Act, or who assault them personally, fancy that in this way they help the drink traffic? If so they never were more mistaken. Every window broken, every house fired, every man threatened or assaulted, drives twenty nails into the coffin of the 'liquor interest.' The trade is sufficiently brutal; it is wise for its supporters to proclaim the fact so practically?" The *Globe* in its eagerness to proclaim its support of the Scott Act, does grievous injustice, by implication, to a respectable body of citizens. The liquor trade in Canada is, with few exceptions, in the hands of honest and conscientious men. For the exceptions, who are responsible, if not Mr. Mowat's license commissioners? The cause of prohibition is not to be served by wholesale groundless abuse of men whose private lives compare favorably with those of any other class of citizens, and whose public spirit is not, in general, open to question. We are not here prepared to

renew the discussion on the Scott Act, but we do say that in our estimation a sound license system, under which the sale of liquor would be very greatly restricted and carefully regulated, would do more real and effective good than the Scott Act or any other prohibitory enactment. There is not, at all events, anything to be gained by applying the term "brutal" to men engaged in a legitimate line of trade.

SALISBURY VERSUS PARNELL.

If there be any qualities which more than others shine forth luminously in the public career of the Irish leader, these are candor and veracity. So great is his self-control that he has never had yet to regret the utterance of a single hasty word, or felt bound to withdraw an exaggeration. His speeches are models of statesmanlike declarations, clear, precise and moderate. The Tories were badly cornered when Mr. Parnell made public the real facts of the Carnarvon incident. They have tried to make the public believe that their Irish viceroy spoke only for himself, and held no communication whatever on the subject with the government of which he was a leading member. Mr. Parnell has, however, during his progress through England, shown not alone the improbability but the untruthfulness of this contention. So deep and striking was the impression made by his statement of the case that the Tory agents appealed to Lord Salisbury for a contradiction, or, at all events, explanation of the Irish leader's declarations. At a meeting in Manchester Mr. J. W. McClure read a letter from the Conservative leader, which for shameless disregard of truth would put a Yankee "boodle" alderman to blush. He wrote:

"Hatfield, June 28, 1886.
"DEAR MR. MCCLURE.—Mr. Parnell's assertions are a string of baseless fabrications. It is false that Mr. Parnell had reason to believe that if the Conservatives got into power after the general election they would have given him a statutory Legislature. No one belonging to the Government or connected with it gave him any indication of the kind. It is false that I was only too anxious to convince him in favor of a statutory Legislature for Ireland, and that I ever allowed the slightest leaning to such an opinion. It is false that 'Lord Carnarvon urged such a concession on the Cabinet,' and consequently false that 'it was not refused by the Cabinet until the polls were against us.' It is false that Lord Carnarvon urged his views in favor of a statutory Legislature on the Cabinet for six months, consequently false that he urged them 'without being opposed in the Cabinet to any extent.' It is false that after the result of the polls was known that the Cabinet averred round in opposition to the project for a statutory Legislature on the Cabinet for six months, consequently false that I need not tell you that the story of the Land Purchase Bill, having been passed in deference to a wish expressed at his interview of the 1st of August, is simply impossible, by the fact that it had already passed the House of Lords, and the Government were publicly pledged to it. The Government resolved upon it as soon as they came into office, a month before the date Mr. Parnell speaks of.—With kind regards, yours very truly,
SALISBURY."

Mr. Parnell could not suffer the "baseless fabrications" of Lord Salisbury to pass unheeded, and, unfortunately for the Tory leader's reputation for veracity, put the whole case so clearly in his speech at Chester as to leave not the slightest room for doubt that the Tories were prepared to give Ireland Home Rule had party exigencies permitted such a course, and that Lord Salisbury was thoroughly cognizant of all that passed between Lord Carnarvon and Mr. Parnell. At Chester the Irish leader pointed out that just previous to his interview with the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, the Land Purchase Bill had been introduced by the government into the House of Lords and passed through all its stages with great and unusual rapidity. This bill had gone through all its stages in the Lords by the 24th of July, and Mr. Parnell's interview with Carnarvon took place on the 1st or 2nd of August. It was then known in Parliamentary circles that the bill had been practically abandoned, that the government had no intention of going on with it. "They had," says Mr. Parnell, "hung it up for eight or nine days before my interview with Lord Carnarvon took place, and a delay of eight or nine days at any time in the passage of a bill would be most unfortunate, and probably would have resulted in its loss for the session; but in the end of July, in the last moments of an expiring Parliament, during a general election, when all members of Parliament were hastening down to their constituents, and when it was of vital moment to wind up the business of the session as soon as possible, a delay of nine days in the stages of a bill clearly proved that the government had no further intention of proceeding with it." Now, although the bill was practically abandoned when Mr. Parnell met Lord Carnarvon, although it was all but dead in the strictest Parliamentary sense, the Irish chief, strongly of opinion that it would be of importance to the peace of Ireland

that that bill should be passed into law, forcibly urged his views to that effect on Lord Carnarvon, who took note of his remarks. "I also told him," declares the Irish leader, "I also told him that I objected to a certain clause in that bill which provided that the remains of the Irish church fund should be used as a counter guarantee. After my interview with Lord Carnarvon that bill was immediately brought forward in the House of Lords, and it was passed through the House of Commons, and passed into law, and the clause giving the Irish church fund as a counter guarantee, which I had objected to at my interview with Lord Carnarvon, was struck out of the bill." In reply to Lord Salisbury's statement that he had fully a month before Mr. Parnell's interview with Lord Carnarvon expressed himself opposed to Home Rule, Mr. Parnell states: "He may have opposed Home Rule in July—he did not oppose it in August, or until December or January following; and when Lord Salisbury's opposition to Home Rule was developed, Lord Carnarvon resigned his seat in the Cabinet." Mr. Parnell literally buries the Tory leader under an avalanche of unassailable reasoning in favor of his contention. He goes on to say to the people of Chester:

"Lord Salisbury further says that it is false that Lord Carnarvon urged his views in favor of a statutory Legislature on the Cabinet for six months. Mark the word 'Cabinet.'—Lord Salisbury says very little about himself, except the explanation that, in the beginning of July he told Lord Carnarvon he was not in favor of a Legislature for Ireland. In each of Lord Carnarvon's denials he seeks refuge behind the Cabinet. Now, it is extremely probable that Lord Carnarvon, being in Ireland all the time, did not have an opportunity of being at a full meeting of the Cabinet to lay his views before them, and the question was not ripe for discussion by the Cabinet; it could not be ripe until the result of the elections was known; until it was found whether the Tory party would have power to carry out anything at all, much less a statutory Legislature (hear, hear). But my assertion holds good, that when for the first time the Cabinet—at all events the leading members of the Cabinet—decided against Home Rule after the general election was over Lord Carnarvon resigned his seat (applause). Lord Carnarvon not only represented himself to me as being a strong believer in Home Rule for Ireland, but he also expressed himself as such to several of my leading colleagues in Dublin whom he saw after he went over to Ireland from time to time; and so far from his views on that question being shaken they became stronger and more confirmed every day he lived in the country. Then we have this interview with Lord Carnarvon, and we have Lord Salisbury's remarkable speech at Newport, in which he referred to me as the Irish chief or chiefest, I don't know which. It was just before the general election, and he thought that a little blame might be a good thing (laughter). I believe the people of Great Britain will come to the conclusion that I was justified in my belief that we should have received such a settlement by the Tory party, and that the chief of the Tory party desired us to remain in that belief prior to the general election."

Mr. Parnell adds that the turn about face ultimately executed by the Tory leader was the most disgraceful breach of faith exhibited towards the Irish people since the Treaty of Limerick was broken. In the face of the Irish leader's unanswerable defence of himself and of his statements against the unvarnished Salisbury, the *London Times* declares that "Mr. Parnell was quite recently convicted of having deliberately and repeatedly affirmed that which he knew to be false." This is a specimen of the "British fair play" to which the Irish leader has been subjected by the anti-Home Rule press. Mr. Parnell, however, issues from the controversy with Lord Salisbury as unimpaired in honor as he is unassailable in veracity. The latter presents the sorry spectacle of the leader of a great party forced to cover his want of honor by deliberate falsehood, the former adds a new title to his many claims to Ireland's gratitude and to the admiration of the world.

BRO. J. L. HUGHES AGAIN.

A friend sends us a printed synopsis of the speech delivered at the banquet given by the local brethren some weeks ago in Toronto to the Grand Orange Lodge of British North America, by Mr. J. L. Hughes, the never-silent inspector of Public Schools in Toronto. The *Mail* report of the festive occasion informs us that the chair was occupied by County Master Frank Somers. On the right hand of the chairman were the following gentlemen:—Most Worshipful Bro. N. C. Wallace, M.P., Deputy Grand Master of B. A.; Bro. H. E. Clarke, M.P.P., Major H. A. L. White, Grand Master of Ontario West; Bro. E. M. Morphy, Toronto; Bro. Thomas Keyes, Grand Secretary of B. A.; Capt. Wm. Anderson, Grand Treasurer of B. A.; Rev. Bro. Hollowell, Deputy Grand Chaplain. The following gentlemen occupied seats at the left of the chairman:—Rev. Prof. Clark of Trinity College; Bro. Wm. Johnson, Grand Master of Ontario East; Rural Dean Cooper, Grand Chaplain; Rev. Dr. Smithett, Omnesee; Rev. Wm. Walsh, Ottawa, Deputy Grand Chaplain; Bro. Wm. White, Grand Director of Ceremonies; Rev. John Galla-

gher, County Master of Frontenac; Anderson, County Master of Dundas.

We give their names, that our readers may fully understand the nature of gathering before which Mr. J. L. Hughes disported himself on "Our Educational Interests." Not a name here but of an open and avowed enemy of Catholicism, and consequently of patriotic union and harmonious action of all classes in the promotion of public weal. Mr. Hughes is a servant of the city of Toronto, whose salary is drawn from the taxes of all classes of citizens, and yet he scruples not, hesitates not, in fact never fails, to insult one of his fellow-citizens, whom he belies and traduces in a fashion too good for any one but a fanatic and fire-eater. Here is the report of his speech as us:

Bro. J. L. Hughes also responded. He said the speaker only was invited to make him a good Orange man. There were thousands of citizens who held the same views and they seek to enrol them in their ranks. The history of the past few months in the Dominion showed how necessary it was that they should enlarge their ranks, bring in all thoroughly legal Protestants. It behooved them to seek to inculcate their principles in the young. They need not go back five years in the history of the province to see that the law with the Catholic hierarchy was fought among the rising generation. Catholics had demanded five things: had got four of them. They demanded Separate Model schools and got them. They demanded the separate inspection of schools and they got two inspectors appointed for whom the Protestants to help pay for. They demanded compulsory representation on every School Board in districts where there was a Separate school and got this. But these were small in comparison to the fourth privilege, which they also at the hands of the Ontario Government. They demanded that the Catholic school should be placed on the same footing as the Public school system, and the educational principle of the country was that every man of whatever nationality or creed should be a supporter of the national system of the province. (Cheers.) Now every Roman Catholic was made by law a principal supporter of the Separate school system. Being the case, he claimed the Separate schools should stand on the same plane as the national system. They had, ever, a separate Catholic system, a separate Protestant system, and a separate system in the rural districts. The Catholic School Board could select their own text-books, while the Protestant School Board had to conform to the dictum of one man. (Cheers.) He hoped they would never be satisfied till they got equal rights with the Catholics in this respect. Then the Government attempted to say that the Protestants must take a school system, or certain parts of the Bible, for use in schools, while no dictation was attempted with the Separate schools. The Protestant School Board of the city unhesitatingly refused to accept the mutilated Bible ordered by the Government, especially as it had been compiled by anti-Catholics. (Cheers.) They were bound to maintain the rights of an open Protestant Bible. (Cheers.)

Rejoiced indeed would we be if Catholic Separate Schools of Ontario stood on the same plane as the national system. For this we have long striven, and thus far fruitlessly contended. Hughes is too ignorant to be a School Inspector if he believes himself that "every Roman Catholic was by law a primary supporter of the Separate Schools." The laudacious Inspector would find great difficulty in telling when such a law was enacted, and are its provisions verbatim et litera. We never believe in taking law from hand from any man, however high attainments in jurisprudence. We legal enactment is referred to, we specific allusion, and if needs be, we recital, to understand its provisions. We are ever slow in imputing motives. But from what we read of our readers know we are justified in the conclusion that he is justifying himself of a willful distortion of fact and a deliberate mis-statement of law in declaring that Catholics in Ontario enjoy privileges and immunities in the matter of education, which them on a higher plane in these respects than their Protestant neighbors.

lies, we have again and again shown not in this Province enjoy even equality with non-Catholics in the matter of education. Their privileges are everywhere restricted, in many cases unfavorable to their grievances many and crying every step retarding their progress. Mr. Hughes knows all this, but he tells it is not his weakness, for he has already dealt with, and we trouble our readers with his repetition. The story is worthy the Inspector the story.

PERSONAL.

His Lordship Bishop Walsh,panied by Rev. Dean Wagner, of St. John's, Rev. Dr. Kilroy of Stratford, John Connolly, P. P., Biddulph, James Walsh, of the cathedral, Monday for Quebec to attend the monies consequent on the conference on Cardinal Taschereau.

Parents who are ignorant of the will be taught by the misconduct of children what they should have