

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
Single copies—10 cents.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidelity."

REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY,
THOMAS COFFEY.

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

Agent for Alexandria, Glenora and
L. 2001-1-1. Mr. Donald A. McDonald.
Rates 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.

Articles 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. 25th, 1890.

HOW THE SCHOOL LAW WORKS.

It will be remembered that we called attention a few weeks ago to numerous accusations made by writers in the Mail to the effect that in certain localities, one or more Catholics who had signified their intention to support the public schools, had been wrongfully placed upon the separate school assessment rolls. We then made the remark that it is highly probable that these persons, if they exist at all, had not fulfilled the easy condition necessary to effect the transfer. It is extremely unlikely that the assessors, who are nearly always Protestants in this Province, tried to increase the Catholic school tax, by unfairly placing on the separate school roll the names of intending supporters of the public schools. As a matter of fact assessors have no inclination to act in this way, even when they are Catholics, and we have never heard of an authentic case when a Catholic who had given notice in the proper way of his intention to transfer his support to the public school, has been placed upon the separate school roll. If such a case has ever occurred, of course it would have happened by some mistake. The municipal officials are, of course, not infallible; but if they sometimes make such a mistake, the law gives them ample means to have the error corrected. Yet we do not wish, while making this statement, to reproach the assessors generally with any desire to deal unfairly with the separate schools. The assessors are as a rule fair-minded men who aim at acting justly.

We suppose it will be acknowledged that the best devised laws do not provide machinery which works to perfection in all cases, and we stated before that we know it to be a fact that separate schools suffer much more from the mistakes of assessors than the public schools do. The reason for this is evident. The machinery by which a Catholic school is made to be supported by a ratepayer is much more cumbersome than that employed in favor of the public school. If it sometimes occurs that a mistake is made by officials against the public school, it will naturally occur much more frequently, and to a larger extent, against the Catholic schools. Besides the more cumbersome machinery which has to be employed in order to make a taxpayer a separate school supporter, Catholic trustees meet frequently the active opposition of municipal officers, as town councillors, or assessors, who delight in taking advantage of any pretext by which annoyance may be given to the separate school trustees. In some cases that we know of the separate school trustees were obliged to have recourse to legal proceedings in order to obtain from the municipal council a single cent of the school taxes of the supporters of the Catholic school, though the council had actually collected the tax.

It is needless to say that the Catholics of Quebec do not impose on the Protestant population the same cumbersome machinery which Ontario imposes on the Catholic schools. The division into Catholic and Protestant school supporters is the simplest possible. Catholics are held to be Catholic school supporters, and Protestants are made supporters of the Protestant schools. This method works simply, and though we presume that even under that law errors sometimes occur, it is certainly very rarely that this is the case.

There is no doubt that the annoying provisions we have spoken of above were inserted in the law for the very reason that the Protestant majority in Parliament would have found the Separate School Act very distasteful, if the bill which became law in 1863 had given to Catholic schools all the rights which Protestants enjoy in Quebec. And yet the school amendments passed under Mr. McCall's administration have somewhat improved the working of the Separate School Act. They have done no more than to correct some of the most glaring inequalities under which the separate school trustees labor. Their effect has been to lessen, somewhat, the labors to which separate school trustees had been put in former years in making out correct

lists of separate school supporters, but with all the advantage afforded by these amendments it still happened that Catholic school supporters were rated on the public school rolls, contrary to their own expressed wish.

A case in point has occurred in Toronto. At the meeting of the City Council on the 13th inst. a letter was received from Rev. Father McCann, Secretary Treasurer of the Separate School Board, showing that separate school supporters had been wrongfully placed upon the Public School assessment roll of that city to the total amount of \$332,403 of assessable property. The errors arose in nearly every case from the omission of the distinguishing letters, P. S. (Public School) and S. S. (Separate School) in the assessment rolls. Father McCann's statements were confirmed by a letter from Mr. Maughan, the assessment commissioner.

A fact like this is sufficient to show the disadvantage under which Catholics labor, even as the law stands at present. It shows also the great injustice which would be inflicted upon the Catholic body if Mr. Meredith's programme were carried out, which aims at increasing the difficulties of Catholic trustees by repealing the amendments whereby Mr. Mowat's administration hoped to render their task lighter, without any injury or injustice to Protestants. Mr. Meredith's plan would certainly succeed in making the working of the separate school law more difficult, and it would on this account sicken from the Catholic schools some petty sums—perhaps to the extent of \$10 on an average in every county of Ontario—for the benefit of the public schools. Mr. Meredith does not rise in this to the dignity of the highwayman. He is contented with the role of the Artful Dodger. But it is a pretty piece of impudence for him to assert that Catholics are bound to support him in his attempt to pilfer from them, under penalty of being held up as conspirators against the peace and welfare of their Protestant fellow-citizens.

AN INCONSISTENT METHODIST BISHOP.

Ex Bishop Carman has another long rhapsody in the columns of the congenial Mail. The Toronto Globe got sick and weary with such nonsensical and without such bigoted effusions. This time Bishop Carman puts the Methodists in the place of the Catholics, and argues that if the Methodists were to demand separate education they would be unjust to the other denominations. Ex Bishop Carman cannot conceive, that every man has a right to educate his own child as he deems fit, and that no law or power can deprive the parent of this right. Among other grand ideas formulated in Bishop Carman's peculiar style we read:

"Anything inimical to a well-administered public school system in a land like this is un-British and anti-British, and seriously prejudicial to freedom and public safety and welfare."

The rev. gentleman should be able to tell us in what particular the Catholic separate schools are inimical to the public school system. The children educated in the Catholic separate schools are on all occasions able to stand the test of the entrance examination into the Collegiate Institute, and in proportion to their numbers obtain greater success at those examinations than the children educated by the much-favored public school system. How then is one school inimical to the interests of the other? All the ex-Bishop's eloquence is lost then upon the assumption of an absurdity.

"Every rate payer," he continues, "in this Province is surely *prima facie* to be regarded a supporter of the public schools. In the Roman Catholic to be excluded? Certainly by no means; for both the Roman Catholic an equal right to good education, and equal honor, privileges, etc., as a citizen?"

But if the Roman Catholic wishes to decline the honor, privilege, etc., why force it on him? If the Roman Catholic is convinced that he enjoys a far greater honor and a far higher privilege in being allowed to give a Christian as well as a good secular education to his children why deprive him from that right? Ex-Bishop Carman considers the public schools as "the nursery of intelligence and patriotism, the glory and defence of our common country, the perfection of everything sacred and holy, etc." Bishop Carman is certainly free to entertain this high-flown opinion of the public school system. But this is a free country, and other people should be allowed to think for themselves, even if they differed in opinion as to the permanent merits and glories of the public school system. Catholic people prefer schools, just as efficient under every possible aspect, but where their children shall not be exposed to loss respect and experience contempt for the religion which their fathers held and died to transmit to them.

But after all where is ex Bishop Carman's consistency? If the public schools are what he believes them to be why does he set up at great expense academies for young men and women, that must be more or less in-

timical to the interests of the public school system, as showing its deficiencies. And does the ex-Bishop pretend to say that all the colleges and academies frequented by young people and fostered and nourished by his Church in Canada are all un-British and anti-British because they compete with the public schools? Probably they are, and it might be just as well to abolish them root and branch in order to give greater scope to the broadening and widening of the wonderful influence the public schools have on the intellect, the religion and the morals of the rising generation. "Consistency thou art a jewel." But ex-Bishop Carman proves himself very deficient in the possession of an article of such rare value.

If the public schools were all they are claimed to be why make a distinction between the rich and the poor? Why deprive the children of rich parents of the grand privileges, honors, gaily training, etc., which are given to the children of the poor in the public schools? Ex-Bishop Carman ought surely to have some pity for the Protestant children of rich parents that he entitles for Catholic children. When he declares it a crime to deprive the latter of the honors, privileges, etc., of public school education, why has he no compassion for the Protestant children that are coaxed into the academies and boarding schools? Catholic parents have just as much right to send their children to Catholic separate schools as rich Protestant parents assume to have of sending their boys and girls to colleges and academies, albeit by doing so they deprive them of all the honors, privileges, grace, etc., that are enjoyed in the public schools. Does it ever enter the head of ex-Bishop Carman that we are a united Canadian people, and that whatever honors, privileges, etc., are enjoyed by a Protestant minority in one province, must, according to every sense of justice and equity, be allowed to a Catholic minority in a sister province. If the Catholic majority in Quebec allow their Protestant fellow citizens to educate their children as they please, and grant them every facility for so doing, why do not the Protestants of Ontario act in the same tolerant spirit of fair play to all, and of equal rights to each minority and privilege to none?

TWO EMINENT STATESMEN ON DIVORCE.

We had occasion a few weeks ago to make some remarks on the article written by Mr. E. J. Phelps in the Forum for December, in which Mr. Phelps takes strong ground, declaring that the only remedy to the evils resulting from divorce in the United States is to take the Catholic position that there be no divorce granted by law, with permission to the parties divorced to marry again. It may occur sometimes that a separation is necessary between husband and wife, owing to persisted ill-treatment or gross immorality, but the facts brought forward by Mr. Phelps demonstrate that the hope of obtaining a complete divorce is the direct cause why antimistrial quarrels are so frequent and why so many families are broken up in the United States. If there were no expectation of a divorce being obtained these quarrels would not be so numerous, and would be more readily settled to the mutual satisfaction of husband and wife. Mr. Gladstone is of the same opinion as Mr. Phelps on this subject. Their defence of the Catholic theory of the indissolubility of the marriage tie is founded, not upon the sanctity of marriage as a divine institution, and on its religious character, but upon the necessity of preserving society from an evil which has attained to gigantic proportions.

It is highly satisfactory to Catholics to observe that these two illustrious statesmen are agreed upon the fact that the Catholic marriage law is the only one under which the welfare of society and of the State can be assured. Mr. Gladstone thus stated his views in his article on divorce which appeared in a recent number of the North American Review: "In the year 1857 the English divorce act was passed, for England only. Unquestionably, since that time, the standard of conjugal morality has perceptibly declined among the higher classes of this country, and roundly in respect to it have become more frequent. The decline, as a fact, I know to be recognized by persons of social experience and insight who in no way share my abstract opinions on divorce. Personally, I believe it to be due in part to this great innovation in our marriage laws; but in part only, for other distasteful causes have been at work."

It is scarcely to be expected that the views of these eminent statesmen will so far prevail with the people of England or the United States as to bring them to regard marriage as anything more than a mere civil contract, but those views are none the less a complete vindication of the Catholic doctrine; and it is only when the Catholic doctrine on marriage will be fully accepted that the great evil which is growing daily more formidable will be corrected.

The Catholics of Los Angeles have erected an orphanage costing \$175,000. A large new Catholic church is to be built in St. Roch, Quebec, at a cost of \$200,000, on the site of the existing parish church.

THE MAID OF ORLEANS.

The memory of Jeanne d'Arc, the Maid of Orleans, has been dearly cherished by Frenchmen for four centuries and a half, and at the present time there are on foot several projects to pay special honor to that heroine and martyr. M. Odry has given notice to the municipality of Nancy that he will present to the town Emmanuel Frenet's new and magnificent statue of the heroine, and it will be erected in a conspicuous position; and Mr. Pagle, the Bishop of Verdun, has proposed, and is engaged in bringing to a successful issue, a scheme to erect a colossal monument to the Maid of Orleans as "a national exploitation and a national testimony of gratitude" offered to her by the French people. The site chosen for this monument is the summit of the hill at Vaucouleurs on which stood the Chateau de Baudricourt, where Jeanne d'Arc was made a knight of France, and near which place she was born.

The Bishop says of the selection of this site for the national monument:

"Vaucouleurs is a historic place, but it is also on the frontier, and no one knows what may happen on the frontier to-morrow. No place is more fitting, especially at the present time, for the erection of this monument than that where Jeanne took up her sword and marched against the enemies of France. This statue on the frontier would be above all a symbol of peace, but at the hour of the greatest peril it would also be an insuperable barrier against aggression. It would protect France by its victorious glories."

Mr. Pagle proposes to preach throughout France and to collect subscriptions of 50 centimes (10 cents) for the purpose of carrying out his plan.

Whether or not Jeanne d'Arc had a divine call for the great work she effected, France owed her an eternal debt of gratitude for having delivered her country from the grave peril to which it was then exposed of being literally blotted out from the list of nations. In the early part of the fifteenth century the king of England was also king of France. The battle of Agincourt and succeeding battles had been so disastrous to France in the loss of her bravest defenders that the rule of England seemed to be permanently established in the country. Except Bretagne, all the country north of the Loire was governed by England, and she was rapidly extending her conquests, and even that portion of the country which was still under the rule of the King of France was torn by intestine dissensions. The Treaty of Troyes was ratified in 1420, whereby it was agreed that Henry V. of England should marry Catherine, daughter of Charles IV., and be Regent of France, and should inherit the French crown on the death of Charles. Henry committed to his brother, the Duke of Bedford, the task of acquiring by the sword, if necessary, and of preserving to England this great acquisition, and the Duke did not lack vigor in carrying out his instructions.

The French Dauphin, afterwards Charles VII., was only seventeen years of age when the treaty of Troyes was signed, but he resolved to maintain his rights by the sword. His forces were on the south side of the Loire, and Orleans was the advanced post of his defence. It was at the moment when Orleans was about to fall under the power of the Duke of Bedford, and while the young King was meditating to flee into the mountains of Auvergne, or even to abandon the country altogether, that Jeanne d'Arc appeared on the scene in 1429 and gave new hope to France.

Jeanne d'Arc appearing before the king at Poitiers, recognized him, though he was disguised, and fell on her knees before him. Charles told her: "I am not the king," and pointing to a brilliantly dressed knight of his suite said: "There is the king." Jeanne could not be deceived and said to the king that she had been sent by God to deliver France. She was a simple peasant girl, seventeen years of age, born a few miles from Vaucouleurs, where the monument is to be erected to her memory, and the claim of a divine mission for so great a work as the delivery of the country was naturally heard with great doubts but on being asked to give an incontestable proof of her claim it is recorded that she told the king certain important secrets which were known only to himself and God. Being asked to work a miracle to prove her mission, she replied: "I did not come to Poitiers to work miracles. Place me before Orleans; I will raise the siege; I will conduct the Dauphin to Reims; I will render to him his kingdom. You will see signs enough. Let there be no more words. It is time for action, not for talk."

She was, in fact, placed at the head of a small and poorly equipped army, with which she proceeded to Orleans. She wrote a letter to the Duke of Bedford in which she demanded the cession of all the French cities in his possession. The letter was only laughed at, but a few hours after it was received Jeanne appeared before Orleans, and succeeded in effecting an entrance into the city.

After much desperate fighting the siege of Orleans was raised. Tournelles, Jargeau, Patay and Rheims were taken from the English, and, as she had promised, Jeanne conducted Charles VII. to the

last-named city, where he was crowned in the Cathedral with great éclat.

From this time the opposite interests which were at war with each other on the French side threw obstacles in the way of Jeanne, until the time arrived when she declared that her mission was ended. She was induced, however, to remain with the army. Her success, unfortunately abandoned her, and notwithstanding that, she evinced always the same personal courage, she was taken prisoner at Compeigne. She had declared that even this misfortune and her subsequent cruel death had been revealed to her as part of the will of God in her regard, and she willingly offered herself as a sacrifice for the restoration of her country's independence.

After a mock trial as a heretic and sorcerer, and after many false accusations against her virtue, she was condemned to be burned, and the sentence was put into execution on 30th May, 1431.

France will undoubtedly enter with spirit into the movement to perpetuate the memory of Jeanne d'Arc's heroism.

THE WHITE CROSS MOVEMENT.

Rev. Dr. Douglas delivered an eloquent address lately to the members of the White Cross movement in Montreal. His theme is one that should address itself to the hearts and feelings of every member of Christian society, whether man or woman, Catholic or Protestant. It is strange that the Rev. Dr., while naming men and women who distinguished themselves in the past for generous effort in stamping out vice and saving innocence, should have made no reference whatever to the Catholic Church and all that has been achieved in every part of the world by her priests and nuns in furtherance of the same desirable object. It strikes us the Rev. Methodist Dr. was speaking only for his own people, to whom Catholic priests and nuns are known only by the calumnies of a Falstaff or a Chivalry. It is about time, however, the Protestant world should wake up to the necessity of arresting the progress of the social evil. From the days of St. Paul to our time the Catholic Church has taught by precept and example that there is no such dishonor in this world, no loss so irreparable, no calamity that weighs so heavily, as the loss of a maiden's virtue—except that which befalls the married woman who is unfaithful to her marriage vows. To preach this love of purity as well by example as by precept, in every Catholic country, hundreds of men have hurried away from the seductions and illusions of city life and society charms and buried themselves in the desert or the monastery to devote the remainder of their earthly existence to works of charity, of literature and of prayer. In every Catholic country the number of young ladies of refinement, of social position and culture who abandoned the world and its false pleasures to embrace a life of austerity, of innocence and of sweet communion with Jesus in the eucharistic tabernacle—their number in fact cannot be reckoned. The Rev. Dr. Douglas could not even make a passing allusion to all this; he could mention Josephine Butler, "who, from the Bay of Naples in the far south to the mountains of Donegal in the north, lifted up her voice for the defence of innocence and the rescue of the perishing." He could instance William Stead, of the Pall Mall Gazette; Bishop Lightfoot and Frances Willard, the bare faced and unblushing woman who lectures in public halls and on public highways, as Rev. Mr. Douglas says, with the culture of a scholar, the sagacity of a statesman and the eloquence of a Portia. Without any pretension to those high-sounding qualifications, there exist hundreds of Grey nuns and as many Sisters of Mercy in Montreal—perhaps not five hundred yards from where the orator was entrancing his audience. Those Heaven-sent messengers of charity and holy peace are daily and nightly occupied in the work of rescuing souls from the haunts of vice, of gathering in the strayed lambs of Israel, of succoring the indigent, and of making easy and accessible the path which leads to virtue and to Heaven. But what does Rev. Dr. Douglas, the eloquent preacher, know about them? Evidently nothing. What can his duped and groping in-the-dark hearers know of them, except what is so industriously told and propagated in infamous and notoriously untruthful works such as that written by Maria Monk, who had herself been saved from death's door and from a life of degradation by the charitable ministrations of those maligned and much-abused nuns. Was ever ingratitude so base or so monstrous as that of Maria Monk? She was found, half dead with cold and rotting with disease, by the Grey nuns at midnight on the public street in Montreal; was taken in and sheltered and cared for, and restored to health, and kept in their comfortable home as long as she was pleased to remain. But not able to resist temptation, and not willing to abandon her wicked course, she left the secure and virtuous home

that had been found for her, and plunged once more into the haunts of vice. She next fell into the hands of some evil designing and unscrupulous Yankee preacher, who, at her dictation, wrote the most infamous book that was ever penned, every leaf of which abounds in the most atrocious lies, and the most sickening details of crimes committed in the convent, that never had existence except in the polluted imagination of Maria Monk and her rev. supporters. But Protestant gullibility is so elastic that ready sale was found for the printed abominations contained in the work, and Maria Monk's abettors, if not herself, made an easy fortune out of the infamous production.

Rev. Dr. Douglas declared "that it is from the Jew we have derived that choicest gift of God to the race—the institution of the family"—inasmuch as Christ, the world's Teacher and Redeemer, was born in Bethlehem of Judea, and His Apostles all came from Judea. The Rev. Dr. is correct enough; but why does he ignore the claims of the Catholic Church, whose authority and whose influence upholds to-day, as it has for centuries upheld, the dignity of the Christian marriage, without which no family can exist? It is true also, as Rev. Dr. Douglas tells us, that "the family is the corner-stone of every state; the asylum of all virtues, and that white rose of purity under whose fragrance all that is sweet, beautiful and divine in society has been fostered. To protect the family in its integrity and virtue, to bear aloft the ideal of social morality, is the most fundamental and beneficent work which can engage the sympathy and fearless endeavor of any man on this footstool divine." Nothing but her sympathy with female suffering and her fearlessness of conduct in maintaining the sacredness of marriage has enabled the Catholic Church to keep intact the Family instituted by God, and prevent society and civilization from disappearing beneath the torrent of human passion in every age of her history. What has the Reformation done for the maintenance of that corner-stone of every Christian state? Luther and Henry VIII. certainly made no effort to hold together the Christian family. They both favored divorce or bigamy. The Reformation denied the sacredness of the nuptial blessing by reducing matrimony to a mere contract or to an ordinary affair of bargain and sale. Even now the Protestant establishment will not refuse her blessing and co-operation to the marriage of a divorced man or woman. Although it is heartily disapproved of such doubtful morality, and must know that Scripture is literally opposed to it; yet it has not the courage or the fearlessness of its opinion, and dare not refuse its sanction to what every Biblical scholar must acknowledge as nothing else than a breaking up of the family and a shallow pretext for the violation of the sixth (7th) commandment. Rev. Dr. Douglas may lead to the skies every fearless endeavor to maintain the integrity of the Christian family, the corner stone of every Christian state; but his eloquent denunciations can never amount to anything, or ever produce any good result, while his church permits divorce and sanctions the legal dimittment of the Christian family. If the White Cross Movement gains a footing in Canada, and ever hopes to do any good, its promoters must fall back on the Catholic Church. Although Rev. Dr. Douglas totally ignores that great and impregnable bulwark of Christian stability, society, before its utter disintegration, shall discover that the Catholic Church, founded by Christ on Calvary, hath alone those secret springs, and that Heaven born authority that can alone weld the social fabric together in strength indissoluble, and thus be, what she was commissioned to be, the salt of the earth, the honor of woman, and the dignity of man, and the happiness and salvation of all.

PAROCHIAL SCHOOL SUC-
CESSES.

We feel a pleasure in recording a great success achieved by the parochial schools of New York in a public competition for cadetships, one in the Annapolis Naval Academy, and the other for West Point. At the similar examination last summer for West Point, a Catholic boy, T. J. Connell, a pupil of La Salle Institute, New York, gained the place of honor above all competitors; but in the recent competition the public school pupils were completely distanced. There were twenty competitors from public and parochial schools. The examiners were all teachers, equally chosen from the public and parochial schools. At the head of the list stood Paul B. Malone with 94 per cent. of successful answers; Robert J. Frost was second with a fraction over 90 per cent.; Thos. J. Dwyer third, had a fraction under 90 per cent., and Patrick J. Sullivan fourth, fell slightly below Dwyer.

These four boys are all parochial school pupils. They have gained the four cadetships which were up for competition in the naval and military academies. The fifth and sixth boys on the list were also

parochial school pupils. The highest place gained by a public school pupil was seventh, notwithstanding the fact that the public schools have all the assistance which the Government affords to education. What becomes now of the Mail's argument, that the public schools of Canada must be superior to the separate schools, because they have more means at their disposal?

The Christian Brothers of New York deserve the thanks of the whole Catholic community for the manner in which they are carrying out their noble work. They do not make empty boasts, but when the time of trial comes their work speaks for itself and puts to shame those Catholics who join with their enemies in declaring that the Catholic schools are entirely inefficient.

THE LATEST JESUIT MOVE.

Under this heading the Toronto Mail tells its alarmed readers of a letter which appeared lately in a French-Canadian paper suggesting the advisability of having the Province of Quebec dedicated in a solemn manner to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. "It may be taken for granted," writes the Mail, "that the suggestion made in L'Etendard (the name of the paper) comes from some one on the Jesuit side, and his aim is to strengthen the Ultramontane and Nationalist cause." In fact no move can be made now, a days of a religious nature, no devotion established or suggested, but it is done for a political purpose. So the writer in the Mail, who knows better, pretends to think, in order to hoodwink its ignorant readers and to excite to a still deeper degree the insane bigotry of those who adhere to the Equal Rights Party and swear by the Mail. It is stated that the writer in the Etendard hopes, through the means of the devotion to the Sacred Heart, to promote national unity and to heal up the sore places caused in the ranks of the French-Canadians by the divisions and misunderstandings that weaken the strength and cripple the efficacy of the great Catholic body in the Province of Quebec. Surely this is something to be wished for. Union is a source of greatness and power to every nationality, and the French Canadians would be recreant to their own traditions and blind to their own national interests if they did not employ every means, even supernatural ones, to secure that great desideratum for every civilized nation.

The Mail, whose chief editor, once a Catholic, knows all about it, relates the origin of the devotion to the Sacred Heart as revealed to Blessed Mary Marguerite at Paray-le-Monial in France. She had for confessor Father La Colombiere, who had been chaplain to the Duchess of York in England after the Restoration, and when he published a small treatise on the revelations made by our Blessed Lord to the highly favored nun it was said that he invented the whole story himself; or, rather, that he stole it from an English Puritan named Goodwin who had written a work on "The Heart of Jesus in Heaven Towards Sinners."

The Mail frankly admits that an examination of Goodwin's book showed that Father La Colombiere, who was a Jesuit, was not guilty of the charge brought against him. The writer, however, shows the cloven foot when he says "that Goodwin did not countenance the adoration of Christ's Body, or any portion of it, as distinct from His Spiritual Being; whereas La Colombiere, or rather the nun, appears at first to have done so." This is a very disingenuous way of putting the Puritan in the right and the Jesuit Father and inspired nun in the wrong. How can the writer in the Mail say that Father La Colombiere, or rather the nun, "appears to have done so." In what way, by what words, or by what stretch of imagination could priest or nun, or any rational being, think of separating the glorified Body of Christ sitting at the right of the Father from His spiritual Being. The Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity of Jesus Christ form but one person. No human being gifted with ordinary common intellect would think of venerating or adoring the living body or blood or soul as distinct from the divinity of Jesus Christ in Heaven. But the insincere Mail would convey to its unsuspecting readers "that Father La Colombiere, or rather the nun, did so in the beginning." As Father La Colombiere, who lived two hundred and twenty years ago, belonged to the Jesuit Order, the Mail could not let slip the occasion for having a rap at the Jesuits. "For wherever they appear," he says, "strife is sure to arise within the Church herself, whilst she is exposed, as in Manitoba at the present time, to the counter-movements which their aggressiveness provokes amongst those not of the faith."

The Jesuits appeared a long time ago in Manitoba, as they did in Dakota, Montana, Washington Territory and Alaska, yet we hear of no strife or dissensions occasioned by their presence. It was the presence of D'Alton McCarthy that caused all the strife in Manitoba.