

stock" in all the jugglery and legerdemain of the old country methods.

In order that our readers may know that we in no way exaggerate, nor do we go beyond measure in the criticism that we, at times, make upon these writers, we will give them a sample of the style and language used by these "wolves in sheep's clothing"—a style and language which the Witness revels in translating and reproducing on its first page. So contemptible and low is the attitude of the infidel organ of French Freemasonry that comment is almost superfluous. Thus speaks that journal in regard to the celebration of the Patronal feast of His Grace the good and venerable Archbishop of Montreal:

"The revolt of the clergy against civil institutions is becoming accentuated. There was, the other day at the Archbishop's Palace, a real council of war, under pretence of the feast of Archbishop Fabre. Our poor clergy, who cannot pay taxes, presented His Grace with a fine purse containing five hundred fine gold pounds, in order to allow him to fight the just demands of the Canada Revue deprived of its property through an iniquitous and arbitrary measure. The occasion was a good one to give full vent to all the rancor and hatred of those holy souls against the audacious people who claim the liberty of speaking freely."

Is it a "revolt against the civil institutions" for the Archbishop to accept service of a writ of summons and to take no privileges, in any way, but obey that summons to the letter, come down from his palace, leave aside all his pressing duties, and give evidence in the court, when he might have had the examination take place privately in his own palace? "A council of war under pretence of the feast of Archbishop Fabre;" whose is the narrow soul from which such a statement—or rather insinuation emanated? What species of distorted mind could possibly be diabolical enough as to conceive such thoughts? Does the Canada Revue imagine that the whole attention of His Grace and the clergy of this diocese is centered upon its little self? It must imagine that it is of some terrible importance, that the ecclesiastical and the social worlds cannot move without that its greatness be the pivot upon which they revolve. It would be more proper, perhaps, that the clergy should refrain from honoring the Archbishop—since the Canada Revue seeks to besmear him with its vindictive brush; they would do well to forego recognizing his patronal feast—because in so doing they risk offending the pure, unsullied, immaculate, virginal organ of infidel morals and atheistic dogma; they should not deprive themselves of a few dollars in order to give a token of their esteem and veneration for the representative of Christ's Vicar, since by so doing they incur the criticism of the hydra of anti-clericalism. "The hatred of those holy souls;" how truly we see green through green glasses and red through red ones! Judging the hearts and sentiments of others by its own standard, the Canada Revue can only distinguish hatred in any dissent from its methods and in any opposition to its wickedness. It claims a "liberty of speaking freely" but the moment the Archbishop, in the interest of his flock, and according to the vows he has made to shield and protect them from all dangers to their morals or faith, attempts to "speak freely" he is answered with an action of damages to the amount of \$50,000. That is the price at which the Canada Revue will allow him that "liberty of speaking freely," which it demands so loudly for itself.

One more short quotation:

"The rabbit commenced. Ravishing wolves penetrated into our houses and soiled our homes; monstrous beings perverted not only the mind but also the body of our children; rapacious beings snatch away the bread from our mouths to satisfy their thirst for gold and silver; ferocious dominators put their foot on our throat to gratify their appetite for domination and authority."

The remainder of this paragraph, although suitable to the Witness, is too vile for our columns; we have some respect

for our younger readers and for the innocence that, thank heaven, has not been contaminated by contact with such foul works. But the foregoing will suffice; what follows it may be imagined by some, and those who cannot imagine it are better without ever knowing the capacity of perverted writers for evil inculcation by assertion and insinuation. Such language is merely the fuming and frothing of distracted spirits, vexed and tormented by impotent rage, seeking vainly to undermine the pure Church of God and to instil into the younger generation a detestation of all that the ages have held sacred, venerable and holy. These remarks are nothing other than bold assertions without any truth and without any evidence in their support, wild declamation without the slightest pretence at argument, and violent censure without either self-respecting dignity, or even a common prudential moderation. In their very excess they over-do the work and the effect recoils upon themselves. We have no intention, nor is it at all necessary, of entering into any defence of our clergy or hierarchy against these vile slanderers; but we reproduce the least offensive of these paragraphs in order to show our readers in what species of Christian charity our neighbor, the Daily Witness, loves to revel.

Some years ago there appeared a cartoon in which Bismarck was represented at the door of St. Peter's; a rope was tied around the cross upon the dome, and the Iron Chancellor was pulling on it with all his might. Satan appeared on the scene, and he asked Bismarck what he was trying to do. "I am trying to pull down that cross and upset this church," replied Bismarck. "I wish you luck, with your work," said Satan, "because I have been nearly nineteen hundred years trying the same thing and I have not yet succeeded; but"—continued His Satanic Majesty, "if you succeed you may have my place; I will resign cheerfully since you can say that you 'beat the Devil.'" Do the Canada Revue and the Daily Witness understand the cartoon?

NO BIGOT CAN TEACH HISTORY.

Recently the Catholic Columbian had an admirable article upon the subject of history as written or taught by the religiously prejudiced. From it we quote the following remark, which is preceded by a criticism of the bigotted spirit in which writers distort history:

"Teachers of history, too, in the institutions of learning, lecturers and public speakers have accepted the erroneous conclusions of historians and continue to spread these broadcast."

This is followed by another very pertinent remark:

"We are pleased, however, to occasionally note the honesty and courage of a public teacher or lecturer who endeavors to disabuse the minds of his hearers of this prejudice against the true history of the Catholic Church and its institutions. But we have little hopes that his words will be effectual, when bigotry has firmly set against them."

Professor H. P. Warren, Head Master of the Albany Academy, read a lecture recently before the Teacher's Institute, in the course of which he said:

"History cannot be taught by a bigot. No history is complete that does not teach the progress of the Roman Catholic Church under the Jesuits and their efforts for a purer priesthood. On the other hand you cannot have a history that leaves out Puritanism. Greene says that the history of the Puritan reformation is modern history. Unless we can teach history in the spirit of fairness, emphasizing all that is good and noble and true wherever found, better

not touch it. In all our teachings we should constantly aim to lead our pupils to the highest and best."

Commenting upon this paragraph the Columbian says:

"His hearers were those entrusted with forming correct ideas in the minds of the young, and many of them are known to be bitterly opposed to the Catholic Church, going so far at times as to present in the class-room their own personal opinion regarding the history of that great Church. As the province of the teacher is truth, the words of Prof. Warren would seem unnecessary, yet he doubtless knows that he had very good reasons for what he has so fearlessly declared. He was very opportune and his lecture should be appreciated by the teachers."

In several of our recent issues we have had articles upon the subject of school-books used in the Public and High Schools of Ontario. We have given our readers a pretty good idea of the anti-Catholic spirit in which the histories of England and Canada have been written or compiled for the use of pupils in these so-called denominational schools. Evidently these text-books are the work of most bigotted writers, and consequently not of true historians. "Since no bigot can teach history" much less can one write or compile a history. Having proven, from the pages of these works that they are pronouncedly anti-Catholic and flagrantly unjust we desire to show how impossible it is for a teacher—already naturally prejudiced—who is armed with such text-books to teach history as it should be taught. There are more ways than one of destroying the faith of a child or a youth, and to destroy the faith in a Catholic is the direct and generally avowed object of these gentlemen who cry so loudly for "liberty of conscience" and "equal rights."

You may poison the mind of a youth against his faith by such means as are employed in those works to which we have referred. But even if there is not poison enough to procure an immediate effect, the faith can be starved out of the child, by constantly depriving the young person of spiritual nourishment. But what matter is it whether the faith is poisoned or starved, provided it is killed in the pupil? Well, this system of text-books is calculated to weaken the faith, by denying it that religious nutriment so necessary, and only to be found in the sources of grace which the Church affords, and finally to complete the work of destruction by instilling the poison of anti-Catholic prejudice and hatred. In fine the work is accomplished and the object attained when the Catholic child has gone forth from the so-called denominational school a full-fledged enemy of the Faith of Ages.

It is impossible that a teacher, who has breathed from childhood the atmosphere of anti-Catholic methods, who has been trained in the ways of Protestant thought, who has studied his history from text-books such as we have criticised, and who undertakes to teach history from similar works, it is impossible that such a teacher can do justice to the Catholic pupil. Granting him all the best will in the world, still he cannot divest himself of his early prejudices, nor can he avoid a predilection for the anti-Catholic side of every question, nor is it to his interest to assist the Catholic pupil in the explanation of a history that if truthfully written or truthfully taught would only reflect the glories of his creed and the splendors of his Church. It is not in the nature of things that a teacher, who has even the slightest taint of bigotry, should be able to do unbiased justice to the subject of history. Too many are the temptations that beckon him into the bye-way of prejudice; too

many are the inclinations that, having become as it were a second nature, overcome his best conceived desire to be impartial. The consequence is that the Catholic pupil, attending non-sectarian or public schools of the class referred to, is in constant danger of losing his faith—we should say is in presence of the almost certainty of ultimate indifference, irreligion, and either infidelity or Protestantism. His companions are bigoted against his faith; on the playground, in the class-room, every place he meets with the same anti-Catholic spirit haunting the place. In the text-books he finds sneers at his creed, lies about his faith, calumnies against the consecrated members of his Church, perversions of facts the most glaring and extraordinary; in his teacher he finds a person who has been educated through means of similar text-books and consequently as prejudice against Catholicity as it is possible to be. That teacher undertakes to explain and examine the different historical questions through the spectacles of his own preconceived ideas and by the light of false history; the result is simply that the pupil is led on, step by step, into the winding labyrinth of sectarianism—perchance beyond the reach of all light from the orb of truth, therefore beyond all hope of redemption.

And even were the text-books perfect, and were the teachers unprejudiced, still there is danger to the faith of a youth from the starvation point. Although nothing may be done to directly slay the spirit of faith, still no nourishment is given to it, and its vitality ebbs away for want of ordinary sustenance. So dangerous are these public schools to the children of Catholic parents that we must be excused for touching so often upon the subject; our sincere desire to see our Catholic children receive sound Catholic instruction and a thorough Catholic education, must alone plead an excuse for us.

"DESIRE," whose question about the "free will of man," we answered the week before last, asks us the same thing again, but in another form. He writes: "Could it be said that the child of two or three years of age has it (free will?) must not he or she accept religious teaching entire in the case?" When a child reaches the age of reason—generally supposed to be about seven—he is in full possession of his free will, he is able to correspond with the graces sent him, or he can refuse to do so. He may or may not commit sin—just according as his will leads him. "Desire" says: "For instance, the Mayor of Montebello was, as a child, brought into the Church; was he there of his will?" No; he was there by the Providence of God, and he left it of his free will, and for the latter act he is responsible. The late Cardinal Newman was born of Protestant parents, baptized a Protestant, brought up as such, educated as such. After reaching the age of reason he preserved his innocence of soul in a remarkable degree, and he eventually corresponded with the grace sent from heaven, and of his own free will he became a Catholic, and finally was raised to the degree of a prince of the Church. As a child he had the freedom of his will, which he had in after life; he possessed the same gift of a "free will;" but his faculties were not developed and he could not distinguish between right and wrong, virtue and vice, consequently, he could not sin. A child of a month old possesses the gift of reason and that of expression, but he cannot use them until his faculties are developed. He possesses them none the less and is not deprived of them by God. So with "free will."