

payers who desire to support Catholic schools? Is it not their intention to impose a heavy penalty on Catholics who dare to give a religious education to their children? And Mr. Meredith has publicly proclaimed that he intends to pursue this same policy. Let us not forget that Mr. Meredith has declared Catholics to be the common enemy against whom the Protestant majority of Ontario should combine. Let us bear in mind that he supported the fanatical attack of the ex M. P. R. for East Durham upon the French-Canadian population of Prescott and Russell, for no other reason than that they are Catholics, and that they are making a laudable effort to educate their children in their own language as well as in English.

It grieves us that there are to be found Catholics, so blinded by their personal friendships and attachments, as to shut their eyes to Mr. Meredith's bitter hostility to the Catholic Church, and so traitorous as to support him in his virulent attack upon their religion.

Not satisfied with his own utterances against Catholics, at the meeting in the Toronto Pavilion, Mr. Meredith allowed that fiery zealot, Mr. H. E. Clarke, to reproach the Mowat Government because it was supported by many Catholics at the elections of 1886. Mr. Clarke said:

"It is a fact that were it not for the Roman Catholic vote, Mr. Mowat would not be in power. He had not one word to say against the Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, but if they chose to band themselves together, Protestants have the same right to band themselves together. (Loud applause)"

These are the words of the same Mr. Clarke who stated at the Lindsay Conservative Convention that his party do not want a single Catholic vote. If Mr. Meredith were not appealing to Protestant prejudices against Popery, he should not have allowed Mr. Clarke to utter such words at his own meeting, without repudiating them on the spot. But so far was he from doing this, that he positively approved of them by his statement that he still held the views expressed by him in the London Opera House, which were identical with those of Mr. Clarke. Why should Mr. Clarke have singled out the Catholics as worthy of reprobation for having supported Mr. Mowat? It may be true that if Catholics had not supported Mr. Mowat he would not be in power; but it is equally true that if Protestants, if Methodists, if Baptists had voted against him in a body, he also would not be in power. It is evident from the applause which followed Mr. Clarke's words that the assembly present in the Pavilion was animated with a spirit of hatred against Catholics, and it is to this spirit that Mr. Meredith is appealing for support in the present contest. He appealed to the same and Catholic spirit in 1886. Certainly if an attempt were made to excite hostility against Methodists, or Presbyterians, or Baptists, these denominations would resent it, and it would be very unjust for other denominations to band themselves together against them for such a reason. We trust that in these circumstances where some disloyal Catholics are endeavoring to gain Catholic support for Mr. Meredith's candidature, as in East Simcoe, West Kent, East Bruce, North Essex, West Hastings, North Middlesex, etc., the Catholics will refuse to be hood-winked, and will resent Mr. Meredith's wanton insults against themselves and the Catholic priesthood and hierarchy.

A BAPTIST MINISTER ON CONFESSION.

Smith, who is under sentence of death for having murdered his wife in this city, has confessed his guilt. The *Advertiser* says: "Rev. W. E. Porter, of Talbot street Baptist Church, was the first minister who visited him after his conviction. Smith received him cheerfully, and after a few remarks Mr. Porter introduced the subject of futurity, and expressed a view 'that if the prisoner did not confess his sins he would not receive pardon.' It would be interesting to know in what Baptist work on theology Mr. Porter discovered this truly Catholic doctrine. If he believes in it, why not preach it, and have it practiced in his own church? There are other sinners besides Smith in this world. Probably there are sinners in Mr. Porter's congregation. Does he ever hold to the same language that impressed so deeply the condemned man as to extort a confession from him who denied his guilt before? Does he ever tell his people not to hope for pardon unless they are willing to confess their sins? If dropping into the ear of the convicted man one mere doctrine of Catholic teaching effected his conversion, why not try it on the ears of his congregation? We do not say that Mr. Porter's people ought to make open confession, as was done lately in a Baptist Church in the United States, when great scandals and the breaking up of families naturally resulted. What we suggest is that sinners should confess in private, as is the custom in the Catholic Church, for Mr. Porter holds that 'unless a man confesses his sins he cannot obtain pardon.' As open, public confession would lead to hypocrisy, to lying and scandal and domestic infelicity, it must not be thought

of. Therefore is the theory and practice of auricular confession the only true and sure way to obtain pardon for sin. Especially would this be the sure and safe way if Mr. Porter had been duly ordained a priest of God and had the representatives of the Apostolic college breathe over him at his ordination saying: 'Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them.' But there is a good deal of inconsistency in men of Mr. Porter's stamp, who on occasion let out the truth, and for some perhaps unworthy object, introduce men like Justin Fulton to befall the pulpit in maligning the time-honored and soul-saving institution of sacramental confession.

CHURCH AND STATE IN ONTARIO.

"Complete separation of Church and State." This is the war-cry under cover of which Mr. Meredith, the bogus Equal Rights, the Orange Lodge, the Anglican Synod, Ministerial Associations, the Presbyteries, and Conferences of various Protestant bodies are making their attack on Catholic Schools, and on the Government and people of Quebec. It is in vain we tell them that we ask nothing for Catholic schools except the money of Catholics. We do not ask the State to give religious education to our children; we only ask that Catholics shall be free to give such education to their own children, and that while doing so they shall be free from the burden of educating those of other people. The demand is just, and in all fairness there should be no opposition to it. And as regards the Province of Quebec, we have only to say that it is the business of the people of that Province to settle their own affairs, and to decide for themselves whether they shall support the Church by voluntary contribution, or by levying upon themselves a tax which can be legally collected. The Province of Quebec does not tax Protestants for the support of the Catholic Church. Protestants, either in Quebec or Ontario, have no right to complain if the Catholic people of that Province prefer to impose upon themselves the tithe system.

But it behooves not Satan to reprove sin. Juvenal says: "We may pardon the white man who makes sport of the black, but who can endure to hear without indignation the Gracchi reviling rebels or Varro abusing rogues?"

The skirts of Ontario Protestants should be very clean of all connection between Church and State; Ontario Protestants should be very free of receiving Government aid for Church purposes, before abusing the Lower-Canadian Catholics for taxing themselves for the support of the Church. Are they so?

Mr. Meredith, in his Toronto Pavilion speech, answers this affirmatively. He says:

"I thought that this battle of Church and State had long been fought and settled, and that it had long ago been determined what the bounds were of the State's jurisdiction, and where the bounds of religious jurisdiction were; and I thought that in this Province of Ontario there had been an absolute separation of Church and State from one end of the Province to the other. But it seems to me, sir, that we did away with the connection between Church and State with regard to the Protestant denomination, but that this connection is to exist with regard to the Roman Catholic religion in this Province of Ontario."

While Mr. Meredith made this assertion he was perfectly aware that large grants of land have been constantly given to the various denominations of the Province, for church sites or denominational cemeteries. A few such grants have been made to Catholics, but the great bulk of them have been given to different Protestant sects. Are we going too far, then, if we say that Mr. Meredith purposely misrepresented the truth in order to excite the bigotry of the audience he was addressing? That he deliberately made this false assertion, in order that he might ride into power by means of the hatred he could excite against Catholics?

On the 5th of February, 1890, Mr. Meredith's lieutenant, Mr. Creighton, of the Toronto *Empire*, obtained an order of the Legislative Assembly for a return of free grants of land made since 1st July, 1857, to persons and corporations, and as we can readily guess Mr. Creighton's object in moving for this return, we may rest assured that Mr. Meredith did not overlook the fact that the return was presented to the House on the 19th March.

Mr. Creighton undoubtedly intended to get information which would enable him to show what Mr. Meredith asserted in the Pavilion, that Catholics were pampered with large free grants of land, while Protestants were left out in the cold. The fact that, as yet, neither Mr. Creighton nor Mr. Meredith has made use of this return to adorn their speeches, or the columns of the *Empire*, shows that it gives information of quite a different character from that which they could successfully use during their no-Popery campaign.

The return shows 177 grants to various Protestant Churches, and 29 to the Catholic Church in Ontario. For the erection of school-houses we find five grants made

to Catholic School Boards, and 138 to Public School Boards in the Province.

It is interesting also to notice what denominations among Protestants have been specially favored in this way. The Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists and Congregationalists have denounced very loudly all connection between Church and State; yet they have not refused substantial Government assistance given in this way.

Among the grants given to Presbyterians, and quietly enjoyed by them, we find two grants, being over two acres in Brant, ten acres in Eldon, a plot in Arden, nearly two acres in Wilberforce, two acres in Picotville, a town plot of ten acres in Sudbury, ten acres in Midland, five in Oso, two grants in Paisley, being, respectively, ten and two acres, nearly four in Warwick, ten in Nottawasaga, two in Fordwich, three and a half in Eugenia, over two acres at Port Arthur, one at Stisted, nearly an acre in the town of Trenton, one acre at Matawathon, one in Proudfoot, ten in McKim, two lots in Huron, besides numerous others which we need not enumerate.

The Methodists have fared equally well. In Minden they obtained a two acre plot on 9th May, 1889, and they hold, besides, four acres on St. Joseph's Island, ten in Montegle, five in Montclair, one in Macaulay, one in Stephenson, one in Wilberforce, one in Glenelg, two and a half in Fordwich, two and a half in Thornbury, one and a half in Sarnesbury, one acre in a valuable position on Victoria Square, Toronto, a town plot of seven acres in Warwick, and other valuable properties.

The other denominations we have named have also received similar grants. The Anglican Bishop of Huron has received extensive grants, and also the Bishop of Algoma. These right reverend gentlemen were peculiarly fiery in their denunciations of the Quebec Government for restoring \$400,000 to the Catholic Church for educational purposes, and to cancel a just claim for property which had been confiscated long ago.

In Mount Forest alone, the following properties are held by free grant to different Protestant Churches:

The Presbyterians have seven acres in different plots on Fergus street, the Wesleyan Methodists have an acre on the same street, four acres on Main street, half an acre on Egremont street and five-eighths of an acre in another plot on Main street.

The Province of Quebec has never attempted to interfere with the disposition of Ontario public lands since Confederation. If Ontario has the right to meddle with Quebec in such matters, why should not the people of Quebec tell those of Ontario that the Baptist Home Missionary Society should vacate Reserve A at Port Arthur, granted in 1886, the Baptists of Lunenburg the property given to them in 1885, and the Methodist Presbyterians and the Wilberforce Methodists should vacate the premises of which they got possession in the summer of 1889?

Mr. Meredith's cry that the Catholic Church of Ontario is subsidized by Government is not only untrue, but it is the eyes of his Orange followers.

TO THE CATHOLIC ELECTORS OF NORTH LANARK.

GENTLEMEN.—A plain and incumbent duty rests upon every Catholic in connection with the approaching election of members to the Legislative Assembly of Ontario. It is in every instance and under every circumstance to support the Reform candidate and thereby vote confidence in the Mowat Administration, which has protected the rights of the Catholic minority of Ontario against the fanatical attacks of Mr. Meredith and his followers. Let no local, personal or minor question shut out from the mind of every Catholic this plain duty. There may be constituencies where the Catholics feel justly displeased with some certain vote or action of the Reform candidate, but the Catholics of Ontario should remember that every Reform candidate is a pledged supporter of the Mowat Administration, and that each ballot cast for the purpose of punishing a Reform candidate for his delinquency is cast against the Mowat Government and against the Hon. C. F. Fraser, who has so nobly championed in this Province the Catholic cause. It is true that in North Lanark the Catholics feel justly aggrieved at Mr. Caldwell's recent vote on the Separate School Amendments, but in view of the fact that Mr. Caldwell in his candidacy has the hearty support of every member of the Mowat Government and that there is no reason to doubt that Mr. Caldwell, if elected, will support the Government, it becomes the plain duty of the Catholics of North Lanark in this instance to put aside, for the moment, any personal feeling and give a hearty and generous support to Mr. Caldwell. The Catholics should remember, too, that when the question of French schools came up in the Legislative Assembly Mr. Caldwell supported the policy of the Government, and that however wrong his vote on the Separate School Amendments may have been, to elect his opponent Dr. Preston would be but to put in power the Meredith party, whose purpose, plan and policy is subversive of all Catholic rights and privileges in Ontario. Were the present contest in North Lanark a mere piece of electioneering in the Catholics opposing Mr. Caldwell, but in the present crisis every

Mowat supporter should and must be a Caldwell supporter from the fact that it is the policy of the Mowat Government, not that of Mr. Caldwell, which is on trial. No intelligent Catholic will have any difficulty in deciding how Dr. Preston would vote upon the very amendment supported by Mr. Caldwell, for the very central plank of the Meredith platform is the total abolition of Separate schools. The broad question which should determine as to how the Catholics of North Lanark should vote is not Mr. Caldwell's attitude on the Separate School Amendments, but rather the policy—the platform of the two parties now appealing for support to the electorate of Ontario. The Mowat Government has stood by the Catholics of this Province in the very teeth of opposition prejudice and is disposed to do justice to the Catholics of Ontario, though it must be confessed that according to their numbers, the Catholics of this Province have not yet received their just share of patronage. The Meredith-Creighton Hughes combination contemplate robbing the Catholics of this Province of their dearest and most cherished rights. In such a crisis it is to be hoped that every Catholic of North Lanark, than whom none more sterling can be found in this Province, will give a hearty support to Mr. W. C. Caldwell, the Government candidate for North Lanark.

A CATHOLIC.

A CLEVER SPEECH.

At a public meeting held in Toronto on the 21st, Mr. Tait, the Liberal candidate, delivered the following very pungent address on the questions of the day:

"Ex Ald. Tait, the second of the Reform candidates, was given a rousing reception as he stepped to the front. He congratulated the audience on the large number of ladies that were in the hall; and he congratulated himself on the fact that his brother candidate had made a fairly long speech, and that Hon. S. H. Blake was to follow him. Therefore they would not expect a long speech from him. He had driven twenty-five miles the day before along the shore of Lake Huron, and had listened to the sound of his own voice for four hours—(laughter)—so that he had strained it and it was not in good order. The audience knew that Liberals were characterized by liberty of opinion—(applause)—so he took the liberty of dissenting from one of the assumptions of his friend and fellow-candidate, Ald. McDougall, who had just spoken. Mr. McDougall had assumed that there were Reformers who were foolish enough to ally themselves with the so-called Equal Rights movement. He did not believe there were any. (Applause)."

A voice in the audience—You will find out on June 5.

Mr. Tait replied suavely to the unknown, who had said that a foghorn and a bell were the only things he had heard; "If I were in the country instead of in the city I should think that some of the farmers had neglected to tie up their calves," a remark that hit the occasion so aptly and so thoroughly that the audience went into a fit of laughter, which lasted for several minutes, and was renewed as Mr. Tait commenced again to speak. The gentleman with the voice was, however, silent henceforth. Now, continued Mr. Tait, I ask you to support Mr. McDougall and myself—I always place Mr. McDougall before myself when I am asking for votes—I ask you to support us as your candidates, not because we are good, fair subjects, but because we believe in the record of the Mowat Government in the past. (Applause) I am exceedingly pleased that we know that we are not called upon to defend the record of the Mowat Government because that is not attacked to any great extent. So far as its financial record is concerned, we are several all round in trouble in that respect. The *Mail*, an Opposition newspaper, had said on two occasions that the Government of the Hon. Oliver Mowat in handling the finances had been economical and clean—(cheers)—and that no charge could be brought against them on that score. (Cheers). Tait saved a good score of trouble. Nor was it necessary to go over a large number of the acts of the Legislature of Ontario under the leadership of Mr. Mowat. That legislation displayed wonderful wisdom and constant desire to give equal rights to all classes of the community. (Cheers). An evening newspaper had said that he (Mr. Tait) had left the Reform party and gone over to the Equal Rights party. There was method in the madness of that evening newspaper. (Laughter). It wanted to help its pet candidate (Mr. E. F. Clarke), and it thought it could help him by saying that Mr. Tait had gone over to the bigots. It was an appeal to a certain class of electors in this city. He would be ashamed to stand on any platform and say that he did not believe in equal rights to every man, of every creed and of every country. (Cheers). And the reason he had supported Mr. Mowat's Government in the past, and the reason he was standing upon that platform to support it, was that he believed that Government had fully and completely manifested a desire to have everyone equal rights. (Cheers). Equal rights was a fine term. But he feared that the equal rights advocated by some gentlemen were of a very peculiar kind. It reminded him of the old Scotchman's definition, "Orthodoxy is my dog, and heterodoxy is any other dog you like." (Cheers and laughter). Their idea was to get all the rights and privileges they could for themselves, and not to recognize the rights or privileges of anybody else. (Applause). One of the candidates in Toronto had said that he accepted Mr. Meredith's platform. What was that platform? It was a platform of abuse against a class of his fellow-citizens. (A voice, "No," and cheers). Mr. Tait went on. If this matter could be settled just now by saying "No" and saying "Yes" it would be a contest of strength, and I think I would not come out second best. (Cheers). If it is not the language of abuse to refer to a section of our people as "the common enemy," then I don't know the meaning of the English language. (Cheers). If it is not a phrase of abuse to tell a large section of our people that they are not responsible for their own conduct, that their doings are over-

ridden by their clergymen, I would like to know what is abuse so far as true manhood is concerned. If any man takes that platform it is simply a platform of speaking against other people. (Cheers). But tell me one single thing Mr. Meredith has said he will do to alter the present state of things.

HE HAS NEVER SAID

he would abolish the Separate schools. Some other people may do it who do not realize the effect of their words. But Mr. Meredith knows that if—and this is only an outrageous supposition—(cheers)—if he was ever able to get there, and if any of the strong Equal Rights were to call upon him and were to say: "What are you going to do about it? When are you going to withdraw the legislation that is to sweep away the pestiferous Separate schools?" he would say, "I don't intend to do it." And if they should say, "Were you not going to meet and check the hierarchy? Didn't you say you would banish the common enemy?" he would turn and say, "Point to any passage in any speech or letter of mine to Archbishop Cleary that I said I would do that; but you can't do anything of the kind." And neither they can. (Cheers). But though his speech contains no suggested remedy for what he says is mischievous, his speeches rouse feelings of bitterness because of how men worship, feelings which ought not to be raised in connection with political questions. Proceeding, he said he would not go into this question of French schools, but he declared his opinion that the Conservatives felt like hiring a man to kick them away from their breakfast for having brought out their complaints on this question so soon. Had they sprung the question just before an election some people might have been induced to believe them, but there had been time to show how unreasonable were the claims they made and how complete the record of the Government. There were two ways in which, if they were determined, the Separate schools could be abolished. One was to follow what the *Mail* had said and "smash confederation into its original fragments" and allow the majority to do as they pleased. Were they going to go into that kind of smashing? Or the other way might be taken. There were parties to the bargain, the Catholic majority and Protestant minority in Quebec, and the Protestant majority and the Catholic minority in Ontario. If the Protestants of Ontario were to come to a unanimous conclusion upon this matter and were to go to England for power to make the change, the English statesman would say in the most polite terms, "Gentlemen, you are a most intelligent and estimable people, but you are only one fourth part in this compact; bring your brothers along and let us know what they have to say about it." But, he said, let us suppose another thing here just now. Let us suppose for a moment that five or six dozen of these English Protestants who want to smash up the schools at any expense were transferred down to Quebec to live there. Suppose the Roman Catholic majority were to go to them and tell them that their (the Protestants') children were not being properly trained, that they were under the control of a clergy who had that the (the Roman Catholics) were going to right their grievances and improve their condition. If such a proposition were made there would be heard a united shout from every Protestant that they would fight first. (Prolonged applause). He would not respect Protestants if under these circumstances they did not act in this way, and he would say further that he would not respect the Roman Catholics of this Province if they would not act in the same way under similar circumstances. Their opponents said that what they objected to was that the Hon. Oliver Mowat, under the influence of the hierarchy—(laughter)—had been induced to give Roman Catholics concessions to which they were not entitled, and one of the first things they would do would be to abolish these concessions. One of the first things they said they would abolish was the collection of Separate school taxes by the municipalities and compel Catholics to collect their own taxes. He would ask any Conservative or Equal Rights present if they would be party to such a thing—that Roman Catholics should have to assist in paying the assessors and then collect their own rates. Another thing their opponents would abolish was the payment of the salaries of the Separate school inspectors by the Government. He attended a Conservative meeting, and while he occupied a back seat he heard one of the speakers address the meeting on that question. He brought his voice down to that religious whisper in which a man speaks when he is awfully in earnest, and he breathed out, "Gentlemen, would you believe that the Government of the Hon. Mr. Mowat have become so lost to decency that they pay only half the salary of the Public School Inspectors, while they pay the whole salary of Separate School Inspectors?" This enormous statement was probably believed by some of the audience. Now, he would call their attention to the fact that there were about fifty Public School Inspectors, and about the average of their salaries would be \$1,200 or \$1,300 each, or about \$70,000 altogether. There were a few men in Algoma and Parry Sound, making an additional \$3,000. Did not Roman Catholics pay their share of this expense? Their share was about \$12,000, and because the Government paid the salaries of these men, after they had borne their share in the general expense, their opponents said this was not equal rights.

POPE LEO'S FELLOW-STUDENT.

More than sixty years ago two youths were fellow students in Rome. One was Irish, the other Italian. At the close of their studies both were ordained to the priesthood, and each went forth to duty; one to Ireland, the other to his native province in Italy. The Irishman named Meehan remained a humble curate to the day of his death; the Italian named Pecci, is still living and is now the head of the Universal Church. The Irish curate was the Rev. G. P. Meehan, whose death was recorded a few days ago, the author of the history of the Confederation of Kilkenny and other valuable treatises of Irish history, ridden by their clergymen, I would like to know what is abuse so far as true manhood is concerned. If any man takes that platform it is simply a platform of speaking against other people. (Cheers). But tell me one single thing Mr. Meredith has said he will do to alter the present state of things.

FALSE PRETENCES.

The following pungent letter from a clear-headed, honest Protestant, Mr. Thos. B. Scott, appeared in the London *Advertiser* of the 22nd:

To the Editor of the *Advertiser*:

Meredith's plank, "Unite, unite against the common enemy," is still doing service. He endorsed it at Toronto. Macklin and Elliot re-echoed the battle cry against the "solid vote" of the Roman Catholics. But on the question being pressed Mr. Macklin admitted that Sir John had at least one half of the Catholic vote. The Liberals, of course, got the other half. Is that a solid vote? This fact must be and is known to the very man who impudently repeated the cry against the solid vote. I believe the Catholic vote is more divided than any of the other churches except the Methodist Church. They are pretty evenly divided between Liberals and Conservatives. The Presbyterian is more solid, being largely Liberals, but the English Church is almost a solid Conservative vote. But who shall have the impudent presumption to deny the members of the English Church the right to vote for whom they choose? Shall the Presbyterians, who are more solid Liberals, go to the more divided Methodist and Catholic Churches with an appeal to unite together, and unite with the Presbyterians to crush the English Church as a common enemy? Would that be either Christian or statesmanlike? "Whoever you would that men should do unto you, do ye even so to them." I wonder Meredith and his party did not find that verse when critically searching the "It is Bible." Such a statement as that of "Unite, unite against the common enemy," expressed by a man looking to the Premiership of Ontario, is simply monstrous. Howling over the French language in the schools, shouting "danger to the State" because a crucifix was found in one of their schools. Would it have been surprising had a Presbyterian catechism or an English Church prayer book been captured in a school house used for Protestant worship on Sunday? Would it have been echoed and re-echoed by press and platform, and shall I say pulpits—(I am ashamed as a Protestant)—but I must say pulpits, too. Yes, there was found a crucifix. What is a crucifix? You agitators claiming to be Christians, answer me this. You know it is a figure of Christ upon the cross. Is that not the hope of Protestant and Catholic? What danger to the State if the children should ask, "What meaneth this?" Would an explanation be dangerous to the children? The danger of the State rests at the door of Meredith and his supporters.

Another complaint is that Mr. Mowat refused to give the ballot to the Separate schools. No supporter of "Separate schools" has asked for it. Mr. Meredith has asked it to be made compulsory, not having a petition from a single supporter of Separate schools. Should Mr. Mowat grant it because Meredith asks for it? The party is now trying to make capital out of the "Equal Rights" cry. That has now got balled down to complete separation of Church and State. Is the Meredith party prepared to accept that? Young men can yet remember when that party lay snugly in the lap of the State, gorging themselves at its expense till choked off by the Liberal party, and though now scarcely out of their wallowing condition for the sake of office they suddenly blossom out into exponents of equal rights. Give them office and their natural affinity for dirt will soon land them again in the mire.

Thos. B. Scott.

Vancouver, Oct.

CATHOLIC PATENT INSIDES.

"The Catholic editorial convention at Cincinnati last week discussed the use of patent plate matter, but with what result we are not informed. The best Catholic papers avoid the use of such matter and properly so, too; for if a paper is to be 'edited,' the editor must select his matter in his Catholic sanctum and not have it shored into his columns from the factory of a literary jobber and pirate. Catholic subscribers are willing to pay \$2 or \$2.50 per year for a good Catholic paper, but they feel cheated in paying \$1 a year for a pagan patent inside with Catholic veneering."—*Milwaukee Catholic Citizen*.

This castigation is severe, but, we must say, richly deserved. It no doubt has special reference to a very pretentious New York paper published by a patent medicine man.

REASON AND RELIGION.

Religion is fast becoming an unknown force in quarters whence a better state of things might be looked for. Some so-called preachers are among the worst. One Mr. Townsend, Unitarian, lately exclaimed:

"Orthodoxy is surely disintegration. Religion cannot be built on a book. It must have a new basis—knowledge. When men shall utterly trust his reason, religion will soar free."

If such as he would read Father Hecker's "Aspirations of Nature" they would perceive that the right exercise of reason would lead men to acknowledge orthodoxy in the authority of the Catholic Church. That distinguished scholar and convert, in his work already named, after proving his argument by close reasoning, and in most beautiful language, concludes in the following words:

"The only road open for us to be Christians, consistent with reason, with moral rectitude, and with a proper respect for ourselves, is to become Catholics. For the explications of Christian doctrines by the Catholic Church are consonant with the dictates of reason, in harmony with our moral feelings, and favorable to the highest conceptions of the dignity of human nature."

It was following out the dictates of this eager desire for the truth, guided by an enlightened reason, that brought into the Catholic fold Brownson, Hecker, Ives, the two Huntingtons, Fathers Hewitt and Walworth, and scores of others. The doors of our Church are always open to such.—*Pittsburg Catholic*.

Scotland has 173 Catholic schools, attended by 37,376 children.