

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 42 and 44 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE E. NORTGRAVE, Editor.

REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY, Business Manager.

TERMS: Single Copies, 5 Cents.

Advertisements: 10 Cents per line.

Correspondence: 10 Cents per line.

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

Catholic Record.

Vol. Dec. 28th, 1889

CHRISTMAS GREETINGS.

Nigh two thousand years have rolled by since the glad tidings of man's deliverance were first announced from the starry heavens and revealed to man on the hills of Judea.

Yet the heavens acknowledge the joyousness of the event when Jesus is born.

It is not permitted usually to celebrate more than one Mass on any day, though the privilege of saying two Masses is frequently accorded to priests in this country for the purpose of enabling large congregations to assist at the Holy Sacrifice.

That Christmas be a day of intense innocent pleasure and home happiness for each and every one of our readers is the Record's deep-felt wish and most fervent prayer.

In the East the Epiphany and the birth of Christ seem to have been celebrated for a long time on the same day, not that the mysteries were at all supposed to have occurred on the same day, but because of the similarity of the rejoicing with which both mysteries were celebrated.

The time when the observance of the feast was fixed to the 25th of December is rather uncertain, though Benedict XIV. was of the belief that it was on this date that Christ was really born.

It is a real pleasure to know that London's best citizens shunned Mr. J. L. Hughes and his harangue.

Mr. Murphy, of whom we have spoken above as having been among the defeated Catholic candidates in Boston, has been one of the ablest members of the Board in the past, and has served faithfully for six years.

Mr. Meredith and the bogus Equal Rights fanatics might learn a lesson of toleration from the conduct of the New Brunswick Government towards the French-Canadian population of that Province.

Mr. Hughes is a religious body. He said all he could against them.

Mr. Hughes is a religious body. He said all he could against them.

Mr. Hughes is a religious body. He said all he could against them.

Mr. Hughes is a religious body. He said all he could against them.

Mr. Hughes is a religious body. He said all he could against them.

Mr. Hughes is a religious body. He said all he could against them.

Mr. Hughes is a religious body. He said all he could against them.

Mr. Hughes is a religious body. He said all he could against them.

Mr. Hughes is a religious body. He said all he could against them.

Mr. Hughes is a religious body. He said all he could against them.

Mr. Hughes is a religious body. He said all he could against them.

Mr. Hughes is a religious body. He said all he could against them.

Mr. Hughes is a religious body. He said all he could against them.

Mr. Hughes is a religious body. He said all he could against them.

Mr. Hughes is a religious body. He said all he could against them.

Mr. Hughes is a religious body. He said all he could against them.

Mr. Hughes is a religious body. He said all he could against them.

Mr. Hughes is a religious body. He said all he could against them.

Mr. Hughes is a religious body. He said all he could against them.

Mr. Hughes is a religious body. He said all he could against them.

Mr. Hughes is a religious body. He said all he could against them.

Mr. Hughes is a religious body. He said all he could against them.

MR. MOWAT ON SEPARATE SCHOOLS.

In his addresses at Embro and Plattsburgh, the Hon. Mr. Mowat continued his treatment of the School Question which he so ably opened at Woodstock.

In the later speeches he spoke in detail of the amendments which have been made to the Separate School Acts by the Ontario Legislature under his administration.

He declared that he had no responsibility for the existence of the Separate School Law as it existed at the time of Confederation. He would, indeed, prefer to see Catholics and Protestants educated in the same elementary schools, and the same high schools and colleges, but Catholics have different convictions in regard to this, and as far back as 1841 had secured a Separate School Law.

This being so, he pointed out the strong conviction of Catholics on this subject, and quoted the inferences of the late Dr. Egerton Ryerson who for thirty-two years was Chief Superintendent of Education for Ontario.

Dr. Ryerson was not favorable, either, to separate schools, yet he said "the Roman Catholics make it part of their religious duty to combine religion with secular education. This cannot be done in the present common schools of Upper Canada; and the consequence obviously is that those people must abandon their religious convictions, or have schools of their own, or get no education at all. The first they will not do. The last an intelligent public ought not to admit. So that there is nothing for it but to permit in a kindly and liberal spirit the only system by which they can be educated agreeably to their own consciences, and without perpetual misunderstandings with the rest of the people. The system is manifestly to let them educate themselves in their own way."

Dr. Ryerson told the public that in his anxiety to urge the abolition of separate schools in Ontario, he conferred with leading Protestants of Montreal, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Methodists, and others to ascertain whether there were any means of inducing them to give up dissenting schools in Lower Canada, and they replied that they could not consent to it under any consideration. To do so "would inflict the greatest injustice and injury on the Protestants;" and it was only when he discovered that such were their sentiments that he came to the conclusion that the separate school laws of Upper Canada "must remain equally just" towards Catholics, as the Dissident School laws of Lower Canada are towards Protestants.

In a country where all citizens are supposed to enjoy equal rights it can scarcely be called fair dealing to make the treatment of Upper Canadian Catholics depend upon the nature of the treatment which the Lower Canadian Protestants desire to have accorded to themselves. Our claim to separate schools rests upon the inalienable rights of Catholic parents, and parents of other denominations as well, to give their children a religious education if they see fit. These rights are inseparable from parental duties towards their children, and they do not depend upon what the Protestants of Montreal may think in the matter, and on the broad principle of real Equal Rights we would claim these rights for Catholic parents, even if the Montreal Protestants were perfectly willing to give up the rights and privileges they now enjoy. Our rights do not depend on the Protestants of Montreal asserting their position that Upper Canadian Catholics ought to be treated fairly, apparently through a feeling of shame to deprive them of their just rights, whereas he saw that Lower Canadian Protestants were determined to retain the rights which a generous Catholic majority had freely granted them. He could not, with any sense of honor, refuse that same to the Catholic minority in Ontario, so he said:

"The question is not whether separate schools are expedient or inexpedient, not whether the permission of them is a wise or unwise provision, nor whether in certain places they are beneficial or injurious; but the question is whether the Roman Catholic minority of Upper Canada should be treated the same as the Protestant minority of Lower Canada; that if the latter has legal provisions for dissenting schools, where they wish to establish them, whether the former should not have similar provision for separate schools where they wish to establish them. The dissenting schools, from the greater wealth of Protestants, in some instances lessen the means of supporting the common schools in Lower Canada to a much greater extent than the separate schools lessen the means of supporting the common schools in Upper Canada. But that is not the question. The question is shall the Protestants of Lower Canada and the Roman Catholics of Upper Canada stand on equal ground and have equal rights in the provision of the school law?"

"Equal Rights" is Dr. Ryerson's own expression; and it shows how hollow and hypocritical in the presence of those who, now calling themselves "Equal Rights," would retain for Lower Canadian Protestants rights of which they would deprive Upper Canadian Catholics. Dr. Ryerson was, certainly, never superabounding in love for Catholics, yet by anticipation he announced the gross injustice of the platform of the pretended Equal Rights of to-day; and though his reasons for taking this stand are not, apparently, so high as they might have been, the conclusion at which he arrives is very creditable to him, as evidencing his innate love of fair play, a commodity of the nature of which the James L. Hugheses, the Dalton McCarthys, the Principals McVicar and other would-be persecutors, have not the remotest conception.

Mr. Mowat has reached the same conclusion with Dr. Ryerson, and we think he is influenced by higher motives, viz: a consciousness of the justice of the Catholic demands, and a desire to see justice done independently of what Lower Canadian Catholics have done for the Protestant minority. He recognizes that in the United States, wherever Catholics are numerous enough and have the means, they voluntarily support separate schools, though they are taxed for public schools which they do not use. He is of opinion that we would be wiser to use the public schools, and we do not dispute his right to have this opinion, though we differ from it. But, as Catholics, we must express our religious education, he declares that it is his wish to be fair to us, and that he has endeavored so to since he has been Premier. He says also that it was quite natural that the Protestants of Lower Canada should have always refused to unite in any movement against Catholic separate schools in Upper Canada, whereas they are as anxious to retain their own separate schools as we are to retain ours.

These things being so, Mr. Mowat maintains that it is the duty of the people of Ontario to encourage Catholics to make the separate schools as efficient as possible, and to give them the same educational facilities as are given to the Protestants. He says: "It is for the common interest that since we must have separate schools, machinery should be provided where necessary for making them as efficient as may be, and for enabling them to give a good education at the expense of the Roman Catholics who wish to support them."

Certainly, this is all that Catholics ever demanded. We never asked anything more than fair treatment, and with anything less we will never be content. These were the considerations which moved Mr. Mowat's Government to grant certain amendments to the School Acts which were seen to be necessary to facilitate the practical operation of separate schools. This is all that Mr. Mowat's amendments effected, and he quotes the late Hon. Mr. Brown to show that this gentleman, the great champion of Ontario Protestantism, was of opinion too that this ought to be done. We will have something to say of these amendments in detail in our next issue. We will here only cite a few words which express Mr. Brown's sentiments:

"I believe it is the universal feeling of Protestant Reformers throughout Ontario—now that French-Canadian interference in our affairs has been brought to an end, now that the Protestant majority is completely dominant in our Province, and the Catholics placed, by their scattered position, at disadvantage—that it is the incumbent duty of the Reform party, dictated as well by their most cherished principles as by justice and good policy, that a full share of Parliamentary representation, according to their numbers, and generous consideration in all public matters, should be awarded to the Catholic minority."

In spite of Mr. Brown's anti-Catholic antecedents, we readily acknowledge that these were noble words.

HONOR TO STANSTEAD.

In spite of the appeals made to bigotry by the Montreal Witness and the Toronto Mail to defeat Mr. Colby in Stanstead, that gentleman has been returned to Parliament by a majority of one thousand and forty-five. At the general election in 1887 Mr. Colby's majority was four hundred and thirty-four. Of course, at the present time, all opponents of the Dominion Government would be glad to see Mr. Colby defeated as they were in 1887, yet the Liberals did not bring out an opponent against him. The party of fanaticism, however, were determined to effect his defeat, in revenge for his statement in the House that the Protestants of Quebec are on amicable terms with their Catholic neighbors, and that the Protestants have no grievances to complain of. The Witness, too, attempted to bulldoze the Dominion Temperance Alliance into supporting Mr. Le Baron, the bogus Equal Rights candidate, but the Quebec branch of that association held a meeting on the 13th inst. at Montreal, precisely to consider what action it should take in the contest, and, wisely repudiating the Witness' advice, it decided to remain neutral, and passed the following resolution:

"Whereas, in the judgment of the Executive Committee, the Hon. O. C. Colby has in his representative capacity been true to the principles of the Dominion Alliance; and whereas, Mr. Le Baron is well known to be a total abstinence, an avowed prohibitionist, and an ardent temperance worker; therefore resolved, that we recommend the temperance people of Stanstead to cast their influence and ballots in favor of the candidate who in their own judgment will most loyally and efficiently serve the interests of temperance and prohibition."

A number of Montrealers, who had before been stirring up strife, including Dr. Davidson, stumped the county, and the Ministerial Association pronounced their abuse at Montreal, in support of Mr. Le Baron, but all these influences together served only to get five hundred and fifty-eight votes for their candidate, a little more than a quarter of all the votes polled in one of the most Protestant constituencies in the Province. It is positively stated that Mr. Le Baron was largely supported by the ordinary Liberal vote, as he had been formerly a Liberal, though many Liberals preferred to vote for Mr. Colby, and that if the really fanatical vote alone had supported the former, he would scarcely have polled twenty five votes in the county.

Dr. Davidson told the electors in one of his speeches that if Mr. Colby were elected it would prove that they endorsed his course in sustaining the Jesuit Estates Act, and the Witness made a similar statement. They have their answer from the electorate. The Protestants of Stanstead have proved what we have all along believed to be the case, that fanaticism will not be countenanced by them.

The Catholic majority in Quebec have no other desire than to deal fairly with their Protestant fellow-citizens, and it would have been a poor return if the latter had shown by their votes on this occasion that they desired to oppress them and the Catholic minority in Ontario. The Empire says very truly that if "the appeal to them could be attended with any other result . . . we must presuppose that the Protestants of the constituency had taken leave of their senses." All honor to the men of Stanstead, who have shown that they are not to be moved by the frantic appeals of bigotry!

There were in Stanstead, when the last census was taken, 4,749 persons of French and 10,807 of British origin. By religion, the census showed 5,219 Catholics and 10,337 Protestants in the county. It is now pretty clear that neither Quebec nor Ontario will be carried by a No-Popery cry.

THE BOSTON SCHOOL ELECTIONS.

In the Boston school elections the fanaticism have had entirely their own way. Every Catholic has been defeated, though Mr. James S. Murphy polled a very large vote, including many fair-minded Protestants. It may be as well so; for it will show the Catholics that the unsectarian schools are unmitigatedly sectarian. It is currently stated that the two Catholic trustees who are on the board from last year will resign, and that the Catholic children will be entirely withdrawn from the schools. The bigots have already declared that Anderson's history will be expelled from the schools because it is "inoffensive to Roman Catholics" and that Swinton's caricature text book will be restored.

Of course the exclusion of Catholics from the Board comes from the votes of the women who have registered; but we confess we cannot understand how Catholics are so apathetic in a city where more than half the population is Catholic. Women saved Limerick, and why could not Catholic women in Boston register as well as fanatics? Is the contest to be given up so easily?

It is a disgrace to Boston that there should be a School Board which will trample upon the rights of half or more than half the population, and render it impossible for Catholic children to attend the schools; yet it would seem that the Catholics have the remedy in their own hands if they will only use it. We in Ontario do not do things in that way. We exert our influence, and we obtain something approaching fair play, notwithstanding that there is amongst us also a party of fanaticism. We have in Canada, and even in Ontario plenty of Protestants too who will not stand by and let such an injustice be perpetrated as Boston is guilty of.

Mr. Murphy, of whom we have spoken above as having been among the defeated Catholic candidates in Boston, has been one of the ablest members of the Board in the past, and has served faithfully for six years.

Mr. Meredith and the bogus Equal Rights fanatics might learn a lesson of toleration from the conduct of the New Brunswick Government towards the French-Canadian population of that Province. Both French and English are taught there, just as they are now in Ontario, as the following despatch shows:

"Andrew G. Blair, Premier and Attorney General of New Brunswick, speaking of public schools in the French district of his province, said: 'We have never had any difficulty in connection with their management. No charge was ever made against my government or any previous provincial administration because French is taught in the public schools, though in New Brunswick the proportion of the French to the population is very much larger than in Ontario. Of course, both French and English are taught in the schools. The French people are anxious that their children should learn English.'"

It is with a feeling of pity we refer once again to James L. Hughes, of Toronto. James L. Hughes has many titles. He is an Orangeman, a Young Briton, a True Blue. He is an amateur historian, Public School Inspector of Toronto and prospective Minister of Education in the cabinet of Mr. Meredith when Mr. Meredith's Cabinet will be formed.

JAMES L. HUGHES lectured in London's City Hall on Friday evening last. His object in coming was to bring the news that three or four Jesuits were working might and main to take away our liberties, destroy our schools, and hurl us back to the middle ages. On the platform with Mr. James L. Hughes were three preachers, Rev. Messrs. Porter and Rogers, Baptists, and S. Bond, whose denomination was not given. Rev. H. D. Hunter, Congregationalist, was not, we are told, on the platform, but took a seat on the south side of the hall. Why he did not go on the platform is not stated. There must be some reason, however, because Rev. H. D. Hunter is very much given to platforms. It is worth recording that all these persons, with the possible exception of Rev. S. Bond, are friends and associates of the Rev. Justin D. Fulton, Baptist, of Boston, a man with whom the higher circle of Protestant clergy resolutely refuse to rub skirts.

But, we beg pardon, we had nearly forgotten to mention Rev. William Junius McDonough, Methodist. He was on the platform too, and quite happy. How did he get the name "Junius"? Although it is a secret, it is too good to be left untold. Rev. Mr. McDonough was a short time since a resident of Strathroy, Mr. Donald Cameron, ex M. P., was, if we mistake not, one of his parishioners. Mr. McDonough deemed it his duty to thunder away at Rome on every possible occasion. Mr. Cameron objected to this sort of spiritual ministrations, and a controversy was the result, Mr. Cameron defending and Mr. McDonough bombarding Rome with all his Methodist might. The letters of the latter were masterpieces, but it was discovered that he had been quoting whole pages from "Junius," altering a name or a word here and there to suit the circumstances of the time. No credit was given to the famous English writer. "Wm. McDonough" appeared at the end of each letter.

To return to Mr. Hughes. In this issue we have not space to deal with the array of statistics produced by the lecturer, but we will deal with them at an early date. His object was to show that a very great amount of crime and immorality prevails in Catholic as compared with Protestant nations. Countries very far away were given in illustration of his contention, but we will be able to follow him even there and prove that his statements are foundationless. We might remark, however, that it would be much more appropriate were he to confine himself to places near at home, so that the value of his utterances could be gauged by his audience. It would, for example, be more to the point, were he to give us an illustration of the relative merits of Catholic and Protestant training at our own doors. It would have been eminently interesting, too, were he to institute a comparison between the conduct of those who were educated in the Catholic schools of Toronto and those who were trained in the schools of which Mr. Hughes is the salaried inspector. It might be added, also, that were Mr. Hughes to remain at home in Toronto and attend to the duties for the performance of which he receives a good salary, instead of prowling about the country at the tail of discredited politicians, stirring up strife between neighbors who had always lived on the most amicable terms, the city of Toronto would not now be carrying a stigma that will attach to it for many years to come.

It is a real pleasure to know that London's best citizens shunned Mr. J. L. Hughes and his harangue. Four preachers of the shouting and ranting order surrounded him on the platform, while less than one hundred of an audience appeared in the body of the hall, composed for the most part of the noisy and un-tutored element who go to church twice a year—on the 12th of July and 5th of November.

CATALOGUED, the Toronto firebrand stands as follows:

Line No. 1.—Hughes said: "I shall not say anything against the Roman Catholics as a religious body." He said all he could against them.

Line No. 2.—"The Catholic Church is a political institution which dares to interfere with the liberty of the people."

Line No. 3.—"The order has gone forth from Rome that public schools must be destroyed."

Line No. 4.—"The Roman Catholic Church has dwarfed the human intellect."

Line No. 5.—"False statistics were given about the education of people in Spain, Italy and Mexico."

Line No. 6.—"False statistics about crime in England, etc."

Line No. 7.—Mr. Hughes said: "You cannot tell me a spot on God's beautiful earth where the Roman Catholic Church is tolerant where it has power." Mr. Colby, a Protestant M. P., stated in Parliament at the last session: "There is no country on God's beautiful earth where a religious minority is so well off or so liberally treated as the Protestant minority of the Province of Quebec." In proof of the correctness of his statement he was elected last week in Stanstead by a majority of 1044, over a bigoted Equal Rights man who opposed him. The Protestant minority in Belgium, France or Italy is not badly treated. The Protestant minority in the south and west of Ireland is never badly treated. Religious wars and bloodshed occur only in Mr. J. L. Hughes's country, the North of Ireland, and only in towns and cities where the majority is Protestant and Orange.

Line No. 8.—"That the late Archbishop Lynch settled what his child should read out of the bible." That was settled by about forty ministers of different denominations. All the Archbishop changed was the ungrammatical word "which" in the Lord's Prayer.

Line No. 9.—"All Catholic children in Parkdale went to the common schools, while the taxes went to the separate schools in Toronto."

Line No. 10.—"Special privileges granted Roman Catholic separate schools in Ontario were denied to Protestant separate schools in Quebec."

Line No. 11.—"All Catholics are compelled by law to support Roman Catholic separate schools."

Line No. 12.—"If the Jesuits had the power they would make short work of the Constitution."

Line No. 13.—"Romish education, where it has been tried, is an utter failure."

Thirteen lies in one lecture. Thirteen is an unlucky number. In 1863 Richard Scott's motion for the establishment of separate schools was opposed by thirteen members, all the others voting in favor of them. The same number voted against the Jesuits last March. It is an unlucky number. No wonder it is called the Devil's Thirteen.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

It is with a feeling of pity we refer once again to James L. Hughes, of Toronto. James L. Hughes has many titles. He is an Orangeman, a Young Briton, a True Blue. He is an amateur historian, Public School Inspector of Toronto and prospective Minister of Education in the cabinet of Mr. Meredith when Mr. Meredith's Cabinet will be formed.

JAMES L. HUGHES lectured in London's City Hall on Friday evening last. His object in coming was to bring the news that three or four Jesuits were working might and main to take away our liberties, destroy our schools, and hurl us back to the middle ages. On the platform with Mr. James L. Hughes were three preachers, Rev. Messrs. Porter and Rogers, Baptists, and S. Bond, whose denomination was not given. Rev. H. D. Hunter, Congregationalist, was not, we are told, on the platform, but took a seat on the south side of the hall. Why he did not go on the platform is not stated. There must be some reason, however, because Rev. H. D. Hunter is very much given to platforms. It is worth recording that all these persons, with the possible exception of Rev. S. Bond, are friends and associates of the Rev. Justin D. Fulton, Baptist, of Boston, a man with whom the higher circle of Protestant clergy resolutely refuse to rub skirts.

But, we beg pardon, we had nearly forgotten to mention Rev. William Junius McDonough, Methodist. He was on the platform too, and quite happy. How did he get the name "Junius"? Although it is a secret, it is too good to be left untold. Rev. Mr. McDonough was a short time since a resident of Strathroy, Mr. Donald Cameron, ex M. P., was, if we mistake not, one of his parishioners. Mr. McDonough deemed it his duty to thunder away at Rome on every possible occasion. Mr. Cameron objected to this sort of spiritual ministrations, and a controversy was the result, Mr. Cameron defending and Mr. McDonough bombarding Rome with all his Methodist might. The letters of the latter were masterpieces, but it was discovered that he had been quoting whole pages from "Junius," altering a name or a word here and there to suit the circumstances of the time. No credit was given to the famous English writer. "Wm. McDonough" appeared at the end of each letter.

To return to Mr. Hughes. In this issue we have not space to deal with the array of statistics produced by the lecturer, but we will deal with them at an early date. His object was to show that a very great amount of crime and immorality prevails in Catholic as compared with Protestant nations. Countries very far away were given in illustration of his contention, but we will be able to follow him even there and prove that his statements are foundationless. We might remark, however, that it would be much more appropriate were he to confine himself to places near at home, so that the value of his utterances could be gauged by his audience. It would, for example, be more to the point, were he to give us an illustration of the relative merits of Catholic and Protestant training at our own doors. It would have been eminently interesting, too, were he to institute a comparison between the conduct of those who were educated in the Catholic schools of Toronto and those who were trained in the schools of which Mr. Hughes is the salaried inspector. It might be added, also, that were Mr. Hughes to remain at home in Toronto and attend to the duties for the performance of which he receives a good salary, instead of prowling about the country at the tail of discredited politicians, stirring up strife between neighbors who had always lived on the most amicable terms, the city of Toronto would not now be carrying a stigma that will attach to it for many years to come.

It is a real pleasure to know that London's best citizens shunned Mr. J. L. Hughes and his harangue. Four preachers of the shouting and ranting order surrounded him on the platform, while less than one hundred of an audience appeared in the body of the hall, composed for the most part of the noisy and un-tutored element who go to church twice a year—on the 12th of July and 5th of November.

CATALOGUED, the Toronto firebrand stands as follows:

Line No. 1.—Hughes said: "I shall not say anything against the Roman Catholics as a religious body." He said all he could against them.

Line No. 2.—"The Catholic Church is a political institution which dares to interfere with the liberty of the people."

Line No. 3.—"The order has gone forth from Rome that public schools must be destroyed."

Line No. 4.—"The Roman Catholic Church has dwarfed the human intellect."

Line No. 5.—"False statistics were given about the education of people in Spain, Italy and Mexico."

Line No. 6.—"False statistics about crime in England, etc."

Line No. 7.—Mr. Hughes said: "You cannot tell me a spot on God's beautiful earth where the Roman Catholic Church is tolerant where it has power." Mr. Colby, a Protestant M. P., stated in Parliament at the last session: "There is no country on God's beautiful earth where a religious minority is so well off or so liberally treated as the Protestant minority of the Province of Quebec." In proof of the correctness of his statement he was elected last week in Stanstead by a majority of 1044, over a bigoted Equal Rights man who opposed him. The Protestant minority in Belgium, France or Italy is not badly treated. The Protestant minority in the south and west of Ireland is never badly treated. Religious wars and bloodshed occur only in Mr. J. L. Hughes's country, the North of Ireland, and only in towns and cities where the majority is Protestant and Orange.

Line No. 8.—"That the late Archbishop Lynch settled what his child should read out of the bible." That was settled by about forty ministers of different denominations. All the Archbishop changed was the ungrammatical word "which" in the Lord's Prayer.

Line No. 9.—"All Catholic children in Parkdale went to the common schools, while the taxes went to the separate schools in Toronto."

Line No. 10.—"Special privileges granted Roman Catholic separate schools in Ontario were denied to Protestant separate schools in Quebec."

Line No. 11.—"All Catholics are compelled by law to support Roman Catholic separate schools."

Line No. 12.—"If the Jesuits had the power they would make short work of the Constitution."

Line No. 13.—"Romish education, where it has been tried, is an utter failure."

Thirteen lies in one lecture. Thirteen is an unlucky number. In 1863 Richard Scott's motion for the establishment of separate schools was opposed by thirteen members, all the others voting in favor of them. The same number voted against the Jesuits last March. It is an unlucky number. No wonder it is called the Devil's Thirteen.

VERY few, indeed, there are who will not read with pleasure as well as profit the noble and patriotic utterances of the Archbishop of Toronto, which we print on the first page. With regret and sadness we call to mind the vast difference between these sentiments and those expressed by the lay and clerical firebrands who are now busily employed in the effort to make a pandemonium of the Province. The good and great amongst us—Protestant and Catholic alike—will commend the distinguished prelate for this timely and most creditable pronouncement. In it they will recognize the ring of sterling patriotism—coming fresh and warm and vigorously from a large mind and a great Christian heart. We doubt not the deeds and words of the good Archbishop of Toronto will ere long bring about in that city of intolerance a better and happier condition of affairs. Malice and ignorance have done and are doing their worst, but such delinquents as the one to which we refer will, we feel assured, confound and silence the malicious demagogues and instruct and edify the innocent who have been tossed about by the prevailing whirlwinds of bigotry.

The clerical and editorial friends of the young persons in Toronto who recently gave such deplorable displays of rowdiness, point to the fact that a like occurrence took place in Quebec, a Catholic city, when the Salvation Army was attacked and the members beaten. The attack was not made upon the Army because the members held religious opinions different from those of the majority of the people, but chiefly because their displays brought together an element which exists in every city that is at all times prone to create a disturbance. Priests and people alike condemned those guilty of the assault on the army, and the administrators of the law dealt severely with them. It must not be forgotten that Quebec is not the only place where the army suffered opposition. In this good Protestant city of London the Protestant authorities had some of the members arrested for disturbing the peace and creating a nuisance by their displays. The warrants were asked for by Protestants, and some members of the Army were sent to prison. This took place not in Quebec, but in London. Had it been in Quebec the air of Ontario would be filled with cries of "Priestcraft," "Romish intolerance," etc.

SAM JONES is like most of the preachers. He knows where he is to-day, but has no fixed opinion as to where he will find himself to-morrow or the day after. He has, we are told by our American exchanges, rapped at the door of Episcopalianism, and admittance has been granted. How long he will remain in that fold it would be difficult to tell, but quite likely the wearing of the gown will bring on soreness of spirit. When he works himself into the enthusiastic mood, and takes to jumping and kicking and flinging his arms about him indiscriminately, and, too,

cannot tell me a spot on God's beautiful earth where the Roman Catholic Church is tolerant where it has power." Mr. Colby, a Protestant M. P., stated in Parliament at the last session: "There is no country on God's beautiful earth where a religious minority is so well off or so liberally treated as the Protestant minority of the Province of Quebec." In proof of the correctness of his statement he was elected last week in Stanstead by a majority of 1044, over a bigoted Equal Rights man who opposed him. The Protestant minority in Belgium, France or Italy is not badly treated. The Protestant minority in the south and west of Ireland is never badly treated. Religious wars and bloodshed occur only in Mr. J. L. Hughes's country, the North of Ireland, and only in towns and cities where the majority is Protestant and Orange.

Line No. 8.—"That the late Archbishop Lynch settled what his child should read out of the bible." That was settled by about forty ministers of different denominations. All the Archbishop changed was the ungrammatical word "which" in the Lord's Prayer.

Line No. 9.—"All Catholic children in Parkdale went to the common schools, while the taxes went to the separate schools in Toronto."

Line No. 10.—"Special privileges granted Roman Catholic separate schools in Ontario were denied to Protestant separate schools in Quebec."

Line No. 11.—"All Catholics are compelled by law to support Roman Catholic separate schools."

Line No. 12.—"If the Jesuits had the power they would make short work of the Constitution."

Line No. 13.—"Romish education, where it has been tried, is an utter failure."

Thirteen lies in one lecture. Thirteen is an unlucky number. In 1863 Richard Scott's motion for the establishment of separate schools was opposed by thirteen members, all the others voting in favor of them. The same number voted against the Jesuits last March. It is an unlucky number. No wonder it is called the Devil's Thirteen.

VERY few, indeed, there are who will not read with pleasure as well as profit the noble and patriotic utterances of the Archbishop of Toronto, which we print on the first page. With regret and sadness we call to mind the vast difference between these sentiments and those expressed by the lay and clerical firebrands who are now busily employed in the effort to make a pandemonium of the Province. The good and great amongst us—Protestant and Catholic alike—will commend the distinguished prelate for this timely and most creditable pronouncement. In it they will recognize the ring of sterling patriotism—coming fresh and warm and vigorously from a large mind and a great Christian heart. We doubt not the deeds and words of the good Archbishop of Toronto will ere long bring about in that city of intolerance a better and happier condition of affairs. Malice and ignorance have done and are doing their worst, but such delinquents as the one to which we refer will, we feel assured,