

miliating; and on his demoralizing barter of their votes to Mr. Crooks as a degradation they have no means of adequately resenting."

Oct. 23rd.

AND BARTERING THEIR SUFFRAGES.

"The Archbishop made it clear that the reputation of Walter Scott and the merits of his finest poem were to be offered up as a sacrifice by Mr. Crooks to the Archbishop's passion for dabbling in public affairs; while His Grace was ready to barter away the dignity of his position, the sacredness of his pulpit, the representation of his people, and the serene purity of his Church in aid of the vulgar Grit combination in Toronto."

Oct 26th.

BISHOP JAMOT ABUSED.

After questioning the correctness of his letter to the Archbishop and saying that he would put him through a critical examination "he must excuse us," said the Mail, "if we ask if logic was taught in his college, and if charity enters largely into his mental characteristics. In just one sentence Bishop Jamot has started half a dozen of untenable arguments, every phrase is inaccurate, almost every word misleading."

Nov. 26th.

AND BISHOP CLEARY LACKS CULTURE.

"We are accustomed to associate with the title of a bishop the greatest of public culture and the dignity and scholarship of an historic office. In the lecture as reported these are omitted. More than that, he has grossly offended against propriety by omitting every semblance of logical argument."

Oct. 27th.

HOW ARCHBISHOP LYNCH LACKS WIT.

"A reverend prelate who had not wit enough to keep Mr. Crooks' secrets of office, and not discretion enough to keep a brother bishop's letter private, should not be rash enough to question the soundness of any other person's wits. There are hundreds of people in various lunatic asylums who lie under the impression that all the world is mad; the number of the unwise is infinite. If His Grace does not mind he may have to go a-tramping in consequence of so recklessly exposing his partners' hands."

And so goes on the Mail, the avowed organ of the Conservative party, heaping abuse and contumely on the venerable head of the man of all others the Catholics of Ontario hold dear, the man and the men respected universally even by Protestants, until one has to turn away in disgust. His Grace the Archbishop of Toronto has not the intellect of a poodle-dog, he is a "booby or bad minded" if he does not condemn the action of Mr. Crooks, as are all Catholics who do not endorse

the use of Marmion as a text book. He is the "nominal head of the Catholics." The Bishop of Kingston is devoid of culture, the Bishop of Peterborough lacks logic. The Mail says so, and the Mail is the acknowledged organ of the Conservatives of Canada. As we have remarked in the introduction to those extracts from the organ, comment is unnecessary.

Oct. 30th.

AND MAKING A SPECTACLE OF HIMSELF.

"As to Archbishop Lynch. The public object to his using the pulpit of his cathedral as a political platform. He took the swiftest step he could take to turn into a political controversy what had, up to the time of his pulpit stump-speeches, been a purely literary question. If there is any politics in this discussion, the fault is his and Mr. Crooks'. If there is any "bigotry" awake, the fault is pre-eminently his alone. He had no more business to assume that Mr. Crooks represented a whole party than he had to assume that the Mail's action was taken for political reasons. Mr. Crooks may and probably will be driven out. Mr. Mowat may not be even sustained in the coming session. But Archbishop Lynch flung himself into his pulpit, raised a cry of "Orange" persecution, insulted Protestant feeling, outraged Conservative Catholic feeling, and made a spectacle of himself."