THE CATHOLIC RECORD ublished Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmo street, London, Ontario. Price of subscription—\$2,00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY.

REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY.
THOMAS COFFEY. Publisher and Proprietor
MESSES. LUKE KING JOHN NIGH and
LUKE NIGH are fully authorized to receive
subscriptions and transact all other busiless
for the CATHOLIC RECORD.
Agent for Alexandria, Glennevis and
Locatel.—Mr. Donald A. McDonald.
Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line
each insertion. Approved by the Bishop of London, and Approved by the Bishop of London, and recommended by the Archbishops of St. Boniface and Ottawa, and the Bishops of Hamilton, Kingston, and Peterboro, and eading Catholic Cle-gymen 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.

Arrears 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 pos office.

## Catholic Record.

London, Sat., August 17th, 1889.

MR. PARNELL'S GREAT

The cable report of the reception given to Mr. Parnell on the occasion of his visit to the Scottish capital, showed, indeed, that his reception was a megnificent one, but It was quite inadequate to convey an idea of the completeness of the triumph of the Irish cause in that historic city. It is no small matter that the freedom of Edinburgh is bestowed upon the leader of the Irish party. This is an honor which neither Lord Salisbury nor his Scotch colleague, Mr. Balfour, could obtain, and its being conferred on Mr. Parnell is an evidence of the strong determination of the people of Edinburgh and of Scotland to assist in winning the freedom of Ireland. The enthusiasm of the people was unprecedented, and every circumstance contributed towards adding importance to the graceful recognition of the justice of Mr. Parnell's cause and of the stainless character which he bears, in spite of the vilest conspiracy ever concocted for the purpose of ruining the reputation of an honored Parliamentary

The whole Liberal party of Scotland united in the demonstration. At the actual conferring of the distinction there were present five bundred delegates from almost all the Liberal associations of Scotland-North, South, East and West -and it is estimated that when the workingmen's address was presented to him at Calton Hill, there were over fifty thousand people present. These were principally workingmen, as it was a working men's meeting; still all classes participated and the Protestant clergy of all denominatio is were as enthusiastic as the Catholic priesthood who were side by side with

Mr. Parnell was the guest of Mr. Buchanan, M. P. for West Edinburgh, at whose house he held an "at-home," at which 150 prominent persons attended The Corn Exchange on very important occasions is able to accommodate about 5 000 persons, but it was unusually crowded for the ceremony which took place in it, so that many more than 5,000 were certainly present.

Addresses were presented from 140 Liberal associations, congratulating Mr. Parnell on the occasion and declaring their firm adhesion to the principles he Baillie Walcott, President of the Edin-Gladstone, the Marquis of Ripon, the Marquis of Cadogan, Earl Spencer, the Earl Russell, M. P., and many members of the Irish and Liberal Parliamentary parties. Thus men who have already governed the Empire, and who are sure to do so again before long, united with those who have filled the position of the Viceroyalty of Ireland, to do honor to the man who represents Irish sentiment and to manifest their abhorrence of the base conspirators whose machinations have brought upon themselves the public indignation under which they ex pected to crush Mr. Parnell.

It is almost needless to say that Mr. Parnell in his speeches was equal to the great occasion which brought together so many distinguished statesmen and so taken up in proving that there were such many thousands of the electorate,

Baillie Walcott presented in a silver

sympathetically, and enthusiastically," ity felt themselves justified in the atti- words, and it was under this direction are rare indeed among Catholic priests, tude they took; but they had enabled that the jury formed their verdict. Mr. and unbeard-of among the Jesuits of the majatty of the representatives of OBrien undoubtedly meant that land. America. Nor have Jesuits, or other

the citizens to testify three times to the faith that is in them.

He then entered largely upon the his tory of the Times' forgeries, and showed that their thorough exposure was not due to any help given by the Special Commission. Chief Justice Hannen had declared that the Commission "could not enter into the origin of the letters." That was his expression. How then was he to discover and to prove that they were forgeries? The task seemed im possible unless the books of the Irish Loyal and Patriotic League were subjected to inspection; "but we obtained our clue to the forger by accident, and we owe nothing to the Special Commission for the exposure of those forgeries."
He showed that the Government, while "pretending to offer the means of vindicating the character of himself and hi colleagues, did everything they could, by the ingenuity of their lawyers, to nake sure that, so far as the principal charge, and really the only charge was concerned, the question of the letters, they should be stopped short at the very point wherein there was any hope to discover these matters."

The loud cries of "shame" which followed this statement are an index to the sentiments with which the people of Scotland's capital city regard the Gov. ernment.

In reference to the fears which have been expressed by the opponents of Home Rule, lest the loyal minority should be oppressed, Mr. Parnell said

"I am convinced that this fear come "I am convinced that this lear comes from a bad conscience. Those who express it know how they have abused their power in the past, how cruelly they have treated the majority. They fear that the recollection of all this will come back and that it will be made a pretext in the convenient them. But I know the Lish for injuring them. But I know the Irish people better than that (cheers) There exists no people on the face of the earth less prone to harbor revengeful feelings. They may be liable to be carried away impulse, but vindictive they have er been and never will be. The will be willing to forget and forgive th past, and to concede everything that they ought to concede to their Protest and neighbors, to concede to their Protest, and neighbors, to make matters smooth and easy, to remove every cause of apprehension from their minds, so that there may be no excuse left for reviving those bad feelings of times past to stop the prosperity of our country, and to hinder the reconciliation of the two nations (Cheers!) nations (Cheers).

It is not wonderful that the demonstra tion has caused consternation in the ranks of the supporters of the Government. It is stated that Mr. Balfour will stump a great part of Scotland to minimize its effects, and he will be aided by Lord Hartington in other parts of the country. Mr. Balfour will take Edinburgh, and Lord Hartington, Aberdeen but the efforts of the Unionists have not hitherto been very successful in Scotland, and it may be reasonably expected that they will be no more so in the future.

MR. WM. O'BRIEN vs. LORD SALISBURY.

Notwithstanding the verdict against Mr. Wm. C'Brien and for Lord Salisbury rendered by the jury in the libel suit brought egainst the latter, Mr. O'Brien's appeal for a new trial on the ground that the jury were mis directed is very likely to have quite a different result. Mr. Justice Stephen, before whom the trial took place, had already given his views as represented. The Earl of Aberdeen decidedly against the whole Irish agitation occupied the chair while the addresses in a series of letters to the Times, and his were handed in, and the Earl of Elgin, as | charge to the jury was a labored defence President of the Liberal Federation of of Lord Salisbury, so that he was simply Scotland, made the first presentation, sitting in judgment on his own expressed convictions. He permitted the Solicitorburgh Liberal Association, was the next General to bring forward evidence on to present an address, and the other outrages in Ireland with which Mr. delegates followed in order. Letters of O'Brien certainly had nothing to do, and apology were read from Lord Granville, Mr. in every respect was as much the partizan as the judges who sat on the Special Commission. The jury must have been of Rosebery, Lord Compton, Sir Charles Unionists, as they had no difficulty in coming to a conclusion within a few minutes, finding for the defendant.

Lord Salisbury's accusation against Mr. O'Brien was that the latter said : "Men who took unlet farms should be treated as they have been treated during the last ten years in the locality in which he spoke-that is to say, that they should be murdered, robbed, their cattle shot and ill treated, their farms devastated."

At the trial Mr. Bigham, on behalf of Mr. O'Brien, admitted that murders had been committed in the South West of Ireland during the ten years referred to, but not in the locality in which he had spoken, yet the time of the court was murders committed somewhere, though the words attributed to Mr. O'Brien were casket the Burgess and Guild Brother's admittedly not used by him at all. Lord Ticket. He stated that there had been | Salisbury, admittedly, attributed to Mr. protracted and conspicuous opposition to O'Brien words which he had not used. the presentation by some members of and then put upon them an interpretathe council, for unanimity in such a tion they would not bear. Mr. Gully, matter could not reasonably be expected, Mr. Bigham's colleague, maintained that but the majority who had carried the Lord Salisbury had expressly stated that proposal had done so "conscientiously, Mr. O'Brien urged that men who took unlet farms should be murdered, and reason to complain of the opposition The judge, however, told the jury that their sacred office, but such scandals as which had been offered to the event of his Lordship was merely giving the effect have been recently unearthed at Strath-

inions on the subject of boycotting are well known, and if Lord Salisbury had merely charged him with advocating boycotting the suit would not have been entered; but Mr. O'Brien objected to being charged with advocating murder, and every one understood Lord Salisbury's meaning to be that he had advocated murder. It was only by the flimsy pretence that he only meant to accuse Mr. O'Brien of favoring boycotting, the possible result of which might be murder, that Lord Salisbury was able to obtain a temporary verdict in his favor, even though judge and jury were favorable to him. This the judge stated plainly enough in his charge, wherein he used the following words:

"In the statement of claim it is set forth that Lord Salisbury said that the plaintiff did wilfully solicit and incite those who heard him to murder and to roo the men who took unlet farms, and to shoot and illtreat their cattle and devastate their farms. If Lord Salisbury said that, you will have to give the plaintiff a verdict and giv you think proper damages."

"MEDDLERS."

The memorable 8th of August has passed, the last day when it was allow. able, according to the Constitution, for the Dominion Government to disallow the Jesuit Estates Act, and the Act, not having been disallowed, becomes, of course, part of the law of the Province of Quebec. The passage of the Act by the Quebec Legislature has been made the occasion of a great uproar and a violent agitation among our Protestant fellowcitizens many of whom have professed to discover in it great danger to the whole Dominion. Among those who have shown themselves most rabid is Dr. Carman, General Superintendent of the Methodist Church in Canada, from whom a letter appears in the Mail of the 8th inst. which stands in sad con trast to the truly liberal and patriotic speech of Rev. Dr. Dewart which we published in last week's RECORD. While publishing Dr. Dewart's speech, we gave full credit to the doctor for the generous and really Canadian sentiments to which he gave expression, but we stated our belief and fear that his generous sentiments would not be acceptable to his brothers in the Methodist ministry, and Mr. Carman's letter proves that our prognostications were

Dr. Dewart, undoubtedly, is a very representative man. He conducts the newspaper which is supposed to represent, more than any other, the Methodist sentiment of Canada, but Dr. Carman occupies a position still more representative. He is one of the two gentlemen who preside over the Methodist Church of all Canada, and as we have good reason to believe that Dr. Williams, his colleague in office, agrees with him in his unconcealed antipathy to Catholics, can it be wondered that we regard Dr. Carman's letter as an indication that the Methodist parsons of Ontario, at least, intend to continue the no Poperv crusade?

We would be glad, to work in conjunction with our Methodist and other Protestant fellow citizens for the peace and prosperity of the country, but if they persist in waging war against Catholics,

Dr. Carman endorses everything that was asserted in the address presented to Lord Stanley by the bogus Equal Rights' delegation, and he insolently asserts that Lord Stanley spoke falsehood when he said, in reply to the deputation, "I do not find any evidence that in this Dominion and in this nineteenth century the Society of Jesus have been less law abiding and less loyal citizens than others." The superintendent says in regard to this statement: "Just as good and true people, for instance, to the Crown and the throne as you, gentlemen of this meddlesome delegation, To put it reverently, is this sovereign sagacity or merely partizan plea? Taose who make history are, of course, not bound to study it or be ruled by it. No matter what Jesuits have done or been in a long career, what doctrines they have taught and do teach? Certainly not Queen Victoria's sovereignty," with much more of this sort.

Passing over the incoherency and ungrammaticism of all this, it implies that the Jesuits of Canada and of this continent have been immoral. We challenge Dr. Carman to the proof. . He knows very well that the clergymen who in Canada and elsewhere on this continent have been frequently found guilty of running away with their neighbors' wives and of other gross crimes, have not been Jesuits, nor indeed Catholic priests of any kind, as a general rule. We must acknowledge that in very rare instances there have been Mr. Paraell declared that he had no that their cattle should be ill treated. priests who have proved unworthy of the day. He supposed that the minor- of Mr. O'Brien's advice, and not his roy, Toronto, Orangeville and Kingston,

grabbers should be boycotted. His Catholic priests, made themselves conspicuous by the publication of indecent or lying literature, like the book of Maria Monk, published under ministerial patronage, or that of Justin D. Fulton. We say then that Rev. Dr. Carman's language in reference to the Governor. deneral is as false as it is insolent. But even if His Excellency had said that the Jesuits are as virtuous, and "as good and true people to the Crown and throne, as you, gentlemen of this meddlesome delegation," he would have told the truth.

We have been told by the no Popery ournals, and Dr. Carman repeats the esertion, that the Governor-General was insolent towards the deputation This is not true. It is true that he did not accede to the prayer of the petition, but is acknowledged that the deputation itself did not expect him to do so. His refusal, however, was dignified and his language was as courteous as a refusal could be.

The petitioners asserted that the Act "is derogatory to the supremacy of the Queen." Lord Stanley told them that this is not the case, and that the best authorities he could consult held with him that the Act was within the powers of the Quebec Legislature. Certainly this would not be the case if the Ozeen's authority were entrenched upon in it. We admit that refusal was in itself a stern rebuke to the bigotry of the deputa tion, but this could not be a reason why His Excellency should inflict a wrong upon the Jesuits, and on the whole Province of Quebec. Bayond this the language of Lord Stanley was as respectful as it could be. If it is to be inter preted as meaning what Dr. Carman says, that the delegates were mere meddlers in what was none of their business, it is because they were so in real ity, not because of anything disrespectful in what the Governor-General said.

The anti-Catholic press endeavor to make it appears that the words of the Governor General were written for him by Sir John Thompson, and that the Government organs are endeavoring to shirk the Governmental responsibility by saying that Lord Stanley spoke his own sentiments. Dr. Carman makes similar statements, but there is no evidence to bear them out.

Tae Government organs do not dens the responsibility of the Government. inasmuch as they advised His Excellency to take the course he followed. But His Excellency certainly implies in his speech that personally he approved of the advice. He was expressly asked by Dr. Davidson to state his personal views. and it seems to be in answer to this request that he said: "I am disposed to let the deputation know wha has been the aspect of the case as it presented itself to me." He also said that the course taken by his advisers was "approved by me not without due consideration.

It is stated on good authority that Lord Stanley expressed himself very freely as disgusted with the rabid ravings to which the delegates gave utterance after their discomfiture, and it is no won der. The Globe pretends to think that his disgust is against the Ministry, because they allow it to be supposed that he gave expression to his personal views but the absurdity of this is evident, and the information given to the public is that His Excellency is disgusted with the delegates and not the Ministry.

The people of Quebec, Protestant as vell as Catholic, did not at first discover in the Jesuit Estates Act the danger of which we have since been so frequently told, for certainly, among the twelve Quebec Protestants who supported it as well as the fifty-three Catholics who are in the elective house of the Legislature of the Province may fairly be supposed to have had among them some love of their religion and some reverence for the authority of the Queen, which would have led some of them to oppose it strenuously if it had attacked either one or the other. Not even the mention of the Pope in the preamble of the Act was to them cause sufficient to induce them to declare against it. Mr. Mercier was so conciliatory and considerate towards the Protestant minority as to inform them, before the Act was passed, that if the mention of the Pope in the preamble were offensive to them, it would be amended so as to meet their views. This announcement was a great concession to a small minority, a concession the like of which we do not meet with in the whole history of Canadian Legislation, and it certainly shows that Mr. Mercier had no desire to create religious animosity.

We can well imagine what would be the result of a similar concession offered to Catholics by any Premier of Ontario. When the so called "Ross Bible" was introduced into the schools of Oatario, it is fresh in the memory of our readers what a tumult was raised in the Province, in great measure by the same fanat. ics as those who engineered the no-Popery cry during the recent agitation.

Certainly if religious teaching was to Province, Catholics should not be ignored. If any religious teaching is to be imparted, we claim the right of deciding what that teaching shall be as far and to an alarming extent.

as our own children are concerned. Hence it was only right that the Catholic hierarchy should be consulted before any steps should be taken in the matter. In spite of this it is well known that it was a committee of Protestant ministers that made the scriptural selections. The selections were shown to Archbishop Lynch indeed, but he made only the slight suggestion that in the Lord's prayer "who" would be a better reading than "which." If any had the right to complain of all this it was the Catholi body. Yet Ontario was agitated from end to end by a no-Popery cry on the ground that Archbishop Lynch was spoken to on the subject at all.

We do not recall these undoubted facts for the purpose of railing against our Protestant fellow-subjects and citizens; but to defend ourselves against the violence of fanaticism it is necessary to call up facts which show its unreason ableness. Lord Stanley reminded the delegates that it is no unusual thing in the British Parliament to liquidate moral claims to property, very similar to the Jesuit claim which was liquidated in full by the compromise by which the Jesuit claims have been settled. The same has been done by the Legislature of Ontario, without interference from Que. bec. Dr. Carman and other fanatics ought to learn from this that by their at. tempted interference with the autonomy of Quebec they have fully earned the designation of meddlers, which he so aptly applies to himself and the bogus Equal Rights' delegates.

MORMONISM.

The Constitutional Convention of the new State of Idaho finds a difficulty before it in the manner in which to deal with the Mormons. A large number of settlers from Utah are in the State, as well as in Arizona, Colorado and New Mexico Mexico has also been sounded as to the manner in which Mormon settlers would be received, but the Utah authorities have learned that their polygamous practices would not be tolerated there, and that the settlers would not be welcomed. To the people of Idaho it appears to be a very un American course to distranchise settlers on account of their opinions, yet they fear that Mormons may so increase as to become the controlling element, and the thought is seriously entertained to disfranchise them under the constitution which is to be adopted, lest the difficulties which have existed in Utah be renewed in Idaho, and that polygamy be strengthened under the principles of State sovereignty.

There are already in the State several thousand Mormons, and if these be made voters there will be offered a strong inducement to the Mormons of Utah to cross the State line and take control of the new State. The people of Idaho are fully alive to the darger, and it is thought that even at the cost of departing from the principle of universal toleration they will adopt the stringent measures indicated to avert the danger : but as it is their acts and not their opinions which are feared, the disfranchise ment will probably extend only to those who practice polygamy.

There is a Mormon settlement also in the Canadian North West, at Lee's Creek, south of Calgary, but it is not certain whether or not they practice their favorite institution. They have been informed by the Dominion Government that polygamy will not be tolerated under Canadian law. Some reports say that they are obeying the law, while others assert that they are merely making pretence of obedience. W trust that the Government will insist upon the course which they have foreshadowed, and will not permit the introduction of the detestable practices which disgrace Utah.

While Mormonism is thus endeavoring to extend itself, it is losing its firm hold upon Utah, gradually but surely. The elections which took place on the fifth inst, showed for the first time a Gentile majority of forty-one in Salt Lake City. It is claimed that this will insure a Gentile government to the city next February, but so small a majority is too precarious to be relied on with confidence. It shows, however, that the Mormons have no longer undisputed sway in their capital, and this will certainly diminish their power through the territory. In the House of Representatives there are six Gentiles and two in the Council, giving the Gentiles eight members out of thirty-six. The Mormons, therefore, still hold the fort, and it is for this reason that Utah's star was not added to the United States flag at the time when four new States were

Since the above was written, the Idaho Convention closed its labors, after adopting an article prohibiting bigamy and pologamy. This will, it is hoped, put an end to the dreadful evils which are so common in the southeastern part of the Certainly if religious teaching was to be introduced into the schools of the Province, Catholics should not be ignored. If any religious teaching is to been practised in that locality most openly

A FALSE TEACHER.

General Superintendent Carman, who formerly was called "Blshop" of the Methodist Church, is pleased to say in a letter published in the Mail of 8th Aug. which is commented on in another column, that the doctrine of Queen Victoria's supremacy is not taught by Jesuits. Mr. Carman's present position in the Upited Methodist Church is intended to be equal to, and even superior to, his former one, though the new title he assumes is somewhat less ecclesiastical When he was "Bishop" he only exercised jurisdiction over the Episcopal Methodist Church, but under present arrangements his authority extends over the whole United Methodist Church of Can-

"Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these things?" Does not Rev. Mr. Carman know the difference between a "doctrine" of the Church, which is a truth revealed by God, and the application of that doctrine to a particular case? Jesuit doctrines, being the doctrines of the Catholic Church of all times and places, were taught 1800 years before Queen Victoria occupied the throne of England, and it can scarcely be wondered at that the Council of Trent, for example, made no mention of Her Majesty, by name, But as far as that is concerned, neither do we find her named in the Presbyterian Confession of Faith or the Methodist "Book of Discipline,"

It will suffice to say that the Catholic Church does teach loyalty to the constituted authorities, whether in the Church or State, each in its own order, in accordance with the distinction made by our Lord: "Render, therefore, to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's and to God the things that are God's." It is the teaching of St. Paul that "the powers that are, are ordained of God," and that we must be "subject of necessity, not only for wrath, but also for conscience sake," and the Catholic Church teaches this principle of loyalty to the civil power. The teaching of the great St. Bernard, referring both to civil and ecclesiastical authority, is one with that of the Church, and the Jesuits have never taught any other doctrine than that of the Church. St. Bernard says : "The precepts of God and those of man representing God, must be obeyed with equal care and reverence, provided that man command nothing contrary to God." (On Consideration book 4.)

The Rev. Dr. Carman's statement is therefore as false and malicious as it is vindictive. We are surprised at such malice in a pretended "master of Israel."

We would like to ask whether the threats to which the parsons are giving utterance very freely, to have recourse to arms in order to set aside Lord Stanley's decision, is an index to the loyalty which is taught by Methodist divines. The Rev. Dr. Moore, of Ottawa. is one of the class of blatant parsons who are so fond of raising the cry of disloyalty against Catholics, yet no sooner does he find that the dictum of the Methodist and Presbyterian clergy is not to be the supreme code by which the Dominion is to be ruled, than he publishes to the world his fiat that the Governor General has pronounced in favor of the doctrine of States' Rights which was decided by the civil war in the United States, and issue will have to be decided by a civil war in Canada, Dr. Carman's manifesto, though somewhat more covertly, contains similar threats, It would seem that if disloyalty is a reason for the anti Jesuit Legislation which the parsons desire so much, the Presbyterian and Methodist clergy are much more in need of restraint by repressive legislation than

Dr. Moore's falsehood is one which has been frequently repeated by the Mail. The doctrine of States' Rights has no more been sanctioned by the decision of the Governor General in regard to the Jesuit Estates' Act, than by his omission to disallow any Act of the Ontario Legislature. In fact, one Quebec Act has actually been dissllowed since the anti-Jesuit agitation has been at its height. By refusing to disallow the Jesuit Estates' Act the Governor-General has simply declared in effect that the whole Dominion is not to be governed by the fifty.one thousand men, women or children who signed the anti Jesuit petition from intario, who for insufficient reasons wish to override the decision of the lawofficers of the Crown, the Dominion Government, even the Imperial Govern-ment, and one of the most decisive votes ever recorded by the Canadian House of

The only two pleas which the petition ers set forth why the Act should be dis-allowed were: 1st, that the Jesuit Estates' Act is derogatory to the supremacy of the Crown; 2 adly, that the Jesuits are an Crown; 2 adly, that the Jesuits unlawful and immoral society. were informed that they were wrong on both points. It would have an intolerable insult to Catholics if His Excellency had granted the petition on the second plea; but if the first plea had been correct. It would of course, have been proper to dis-Rights', therefore, stands exactly as it did before Lord Stanley administered to the meddlere his well-deserved rebake.

CHURCH AND SCHOOL REV. ENUES.

A late number of the Chicago Times makes certain statements which are quite on a par with the Mail's oft reiterated mendacious assertions concerning the Catholic Church in Canada. Concerning the figures given in the first statement of that journal we have nothing definite to say now as we have not at hand the statistics whereby either to verify or refute it : that is, "In Chicago the church property of the Catholics is vastly more valuable than that of all other Christian beliefs put together ; for, out of a total valuation of \$9,690,000 considerably over \$5,000,000 worth is owned by Catholica."

It must be borne in mind, however that in the above estimate, parochial schools and academies are confessedly included, and though it is not expressly mentioned, hospitals and charitable in stitutions also. These are not estimated, of course, in the figures expressing the amount of Protestant church property. The Times also tells us "the statement is not surprising when one remembers that 450 000 people, over half the city's pres ent population, are Catholics." The next statement is, however, most

absurd. It is said : "A large revenue goes into the Catholic Church from parochial schools, the parents, if able, paying for the children's tuition. This revenue is largely invested in missions and orphanages.

It is well known that there is not and cannot be a revenue arising from the schools, except what is paid out immediately for the expenses of teachers and school maintenance. Instead of the Church deriving untold wealth from the revenues of the schools, these are one of the channels through which the revenues of the churches, which should legitimately go towards the support of the clergy or the erection of churches, are frequently expended to a large amount, and the Cath. olic people are unjustly taxed to educate the children of their Protestant neighbors, while they tax themselves to keep in a flourishing condition schools to which they can conscientiously send their own chil-

The Times says: "The Catholic parochial schools in Chicago are attended by about | s forty three thousand children, which is over half the school population of the

Does it not occur to the Times that if these children were attending the public schools it would be necessary for the city to supply more than double the number of teachers now employed, and more than double the amount of school accommodation? It follows, therefore, that the parochial schools save to the city the full amount, which is expended by the Catholies for the support of Catholic schools, and Catholics are robbed by unjust school laws of more than half of the same amount. The education of the Catholic children must coet at least \$516,000 annually, estimating the cost at the low amount of \$12 per capita This will give some idea of the megnitude of the injus tice to which the Catholics of the United States are subjected. The only remedy for this state of things is to let the Catholics have a national system of denominational schools similar to that enjoyed by Catholics in Ontario and Protestants in

draws the far-fetched conclusion that the Christians of Chicago are paying nearly one-tenth of all that they possess as tithes to the Church. This is certainly a most exaggerated statement, and, especially as far as Catholics are concerned, the sneer of the Times is unjustifiable that Christian. Ity is "a matter of dollars and giving," and "money is expected to purchase absolution." Of course churches cannot be sustained, priests supported, and schools and works of charity established without liberal support being given to these by the people, but we can assert for Chicago as for other cities both in the United States and Canada, that the money which 1- paid for these objects by Catholics is well spent, and well managed, and that there is ample return made to the people who contribute in the preservation of religion and morality, and in the excellent charitable and educational establishments thereby maintained. We do not approve of grossly exaggerated statements like those made by the Times, but if the correct amounts paid were rigidly scrutinized, the results would be what we have indicated.

By further jumbling figures the Times

As regards the large value at which church property is estimated it is to be remarked that it is the permanent result of many years of labor and toil on the part of priests and lalty. It is, therefore, not to be computed as if it were an annual outlay. When this is considered it will be seen not to be excessive that over four hundred and fifty thousand people should own \$5,000,000 worth of churches, hos-pitals, schools, and buildings for charitable amounts to \$11.11 per purposes. It capita, and, after all, the people are in actual evjoyment of this fruit of their past labor. It must be remembered, too, hat towards this amount the contribu tions of the wealthy who were able to afford it were larger than the per capita sum here stated, while a much smaller sum was contributed by those who were not able to afford this amount.