

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

Published weekly at 46 and 48 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS:
REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,
Author of "Niches of Modern India."

REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY,
THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor.

Messrs. DONAT CROWE, LUKE KING and JOHN NICH are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Agents for Alexandria, Giannina and Lodi—Mr. Donald A. McDonald.

Advertisements—Ten cents per line each insertion.

Approved by the Bishop of London, and recommended by the Archbishop of St. Boniface, the Bishops of Ottawa, Hamilton, Kingston, and Peterborough, and leading Catholic Clergymen 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.

Articles 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 post office.

Catholic Record.

London, Sat. Feb. 16th, 1889.

DIOCESES OF HAMILTON AND PETERBORO.

On Tuesday afternoon we received a telegram conveying the important intelligence that the Roman Bulls appointing Bishop Dowling to Hamilton and Dean O'Connor to Peterboro have reached this country.

"DR." KANE, OF BELFAST.

The Rev. Dr. Kane, who, with Mr. J. B. Smith, came here to champion the cause of Balfourism and Cserlon, has lately been giving exhibitions of vulgar brutality and violent bigotry at which even Mr. Johnston, of Ballykilbeg, expressed himself humbled and degraded. The occasion was the annual meeting of the Irish Temperance League, at which Mr. Johnston, M. P., presided. The Dublin Freeman's Journal says that the red rag, which excited the fury of the reverend doctor, was the name of Mr. Biggar, M. P., in a resolution thanking certain members of Parliament for introducing a bill to carry out the recommendations of the select committee on Sunday closing. The meeting was a mixed gathering of gentlemen of different persuasions and convictions both political and religious. The Sunday closing movement originated and became a success in the archdiocese of Cashel, where factions met and fought, and where tipping was not confined to race course or fair day gatherings. Archbishop Croke issued a pastoral letter that was read and published in every church and chapel of the diocese. In this mandate His Grace vehemently denounced the practice of tipping on Sundays, and portrayed the scandalous results inseparable from such anti-Catholic and soul destroying habits. His Grace concluded his admirable letter by pronouncing sentences of excommunication against any person guilty of selling or purchasing liquor on Sunday. The most beneficial results flowed from this determined stand taken by a prelate who is so very popular, and whose word is law in the extensive districts over which he rules spiritually. All feuds and faction fights came to a happy termination, and Tipperary became a model county for happy homes and quiet observance of the Lord's day. The promoters of the temperance cause in Dublin and other cities have been for some years using all their political influence to have a law passed in the House of Commons similar to our admirable Crooke's act, in virtue of which all sale or purchase of liquor on Sunday would be considered a misdemeanor, and punished as such. The beer and whiskey interests, which are very powerful in England, have been resisting legislation for Ireland in this particular, under the apprehension that similar laws would soon be called for in England and Scotland. The temperance workers have agreed to forget all party bitterness and seek all other questions that divide them so as to unite their strength on this one point so well calculated to promote the moral improvement of the country at large. Thus Tories and Liberals, Unionists and Home Rulers are equally accepted as members of the Temperance League. Col. Saunders, of Derry, and Johnston, of Ballykilbeg, stand on the same platform with Messrs. Healy, Biggar and C. S. Parnell. The cause was working admirably together and producing good fruit both in England and Ireland. A select committee was lately appointed in the British Parliament to examine into the advisability of framing laws enforcing the Sunday closing movement. At the meeting held in Ulster Hall, Dublin, on the 17th of January last, a resolution of thanks was passed to the members of Parliament who introduced the bill recommended by the league. Gentlemen of every shade of political feeling were among the speakers and all was perfectly satisfactory and harmonious until Rev. Dr. Kane stood up with fire in his eye and made a fierce attack upon Mr. Biggar, whose name appeared on the list of those who spoke in the House of Commons in favor of the resolution. To move a vote of thanks to Mr. Biggar was outrageous," he shouted, "and any man who held up a hand in favor of such a

vote was trifling with treason and trucking with sedition." "Let any man," he cried, "who wanted to vote thanks to Biggar, go down to St. Mary's hall, Ulster hall was no place for trimmers and truckers with Parnellism and crime. Mr. Biggar is the man," he continued, "whose only objection to murder is that sometimes the wrong man is murdered." These fanatical and intolerant denunciations of the rev. fire-brand changed the peaceful and happy temperance meeting into a veritable bear garden. Mr. Biggar's friends, and they were many, loudly protested against such uncalled-for onslaughts on a man who served the cause they were advocating. But Dr. Kane had also a body guard who shouted back defiance. The Freeman's Journal stated that Mr. Johnston, of Ballykilbeg, who presided, called the fanatical speaker to order several times and in the most pointed manner dissipated himself from the aniles of Dr. Kane and set that worthy a needed example of common sense and good manners.

The people of London who, in our city hall, listened to the same Dr. Kane's rabid utterances, must recognize their friend in the Freeman's pen picture of him. But they must be utterly astounded at the moral courage which no man here seemed to possess, but which Mr. Johnston, head Orangeman though he be, displayed in imposing silence on the rev. disturber and in disclaiming all responsibility for such uncalled-for and such inopportune expressions of fanaticism and intolerance.

We trust the gentlemen who gave so hearty a welcome to Dr. Kane and applauded his wild and untruthful assertions on a former occasion in this city, will learn to appreciate him at his just value, and know how to treat him if he again condescend to honor London with his presence, and to favor our citizens with his blessed and fire brand views on Catholicity and Home Rule for Ireland.

THE POPE'S TEMPORAL POWER.

It is very commonly assumed by the non-Catholic press that Italian unity as it exists at present is a fact so fixed that the re-acquisition of temporal power by the Pope is altogether hopeless. An article in a late issue of the Globe not only takes the view that the restoration of the Pope to his temporal dominions will never take place, but maintains that it is not even desirable for the Pope himself, or for the Catholic Church, that such a restoration should be accomplished. We are not disposed to deny the fair intentions of our contemporary towards Catholics and the Catholic Church, for the Globe has frequently made manifest its desire for equal justice to Catholics and Protestants, but on the question of the Pope's temporal rights we must say that our contemporary is not in a position to form a correct judgment. We do not deny that it is very natural that a Protestant journal should look at the Catholic Church just as it looks at any of the sects into which Protestantism is divided. From this point of view our contemporary very gravely draws the conclusion that Pope Leo XIII. no more needs temporal dominion than does "Bishop Carman" or "Bishop Williams" for the work of superintending the Methodist Church. When it is remembered that the number of Methodists, by the last census, was 540,000 in Ontario and the North West, counting together the Methodist Church of Canada and the Episcopal Methodists, who, we believe, are united under the superintendence of Rev. Messrs. Carman and Williams, the ludicrousness of the comparison will be seen. The Methodists, Presbyterians, and other Protestant denominations are confessedly merely local institutions. Even the National Protestant churches are but local. What Lord Macaulay said in 1840 is equally true to-day:

"The reformed churches were mere national churches. The Church of England existed for England alone. It was an institution as purely local as the Court of Common Pleas, and was utterly without any machinery for foreign operations. The Church of Scotland, in the same manner, existed for Scotland alone. The operations of the Catholic Church, on the other hand, took in the whole world. Nobody at Linbeth or at Edinburgh troubled himself about what was doing in Poland or Bavaria. But Carman and Williams were, at Rome, objects of as much interest as the parishes of St. John Lateran."

It is true that Canadian Methodism has some few missionaries in Japan, but it will not be said that this constitutes it a universal Church. The Catholic Church, on the other hand, extends her influence into every nation. If the Canadian Methodist Conference were to pronounce that smoking is a sin, as it is at any day not at all unlikely to do, what influence would the decision have on the habits of the people of Amsterdam or Berlin? But the decrees of the Pope are accepted and obeyed in every clime and country. Even when Victor Emmanuel entered Rome, he declared that the position of the Pope was not merely an Italian question. He said: "The Government of the king will protect the interest which the whole Catholic world possesses in the entire independence of the Pope." There is surely no such universal interest in the absolute independence of Superintendents Carman and Williams: (We believe these gentlemen do not claim the title of Bishop, which is given to them by the Globe.) It is, there-

fore, scarcely correct to put their case and that of the Sovereign Pontiff on one level. There is some difference, surely, between Toronto, the Methodist capital of Ontario, and—save the mark—of Japan, and Rome, the ecclesiastical capital of the world. It is therefore, difficult to conceive that the following could have been seriously penned by the Globe's editor:

"Why it should be thought necessary that the Pope, in order to become a great spiritual potentate, should become once more a petty Italian ruler, is what we have never been able to understand. It would not help Bishops Carman and Williams one bit in their work as superintendents of the Methodist Church to have each a town to himself, which he could manage or mismanage at his sovereign pleasure. We rather think such a supposed privilege would be a distinct and positive hindrance. Why then should it be different with Leo XIII., who, as far as the outside world either knows or cares, has exclusively a spiritual function, just such as is that of Methodist Bishops or Presbyterian Moderators?"

It is not a question of the largeness of the State of which the Pope shall be sovereign, but the question is, shall the Pope, who, as Supreme Head of the Universal Church, must direct the consciences of kings and princes everywhere, as well as of their subjects, be free to do so? Or shall he be subject to the caprices and interference of a monarch and a Government who are just as likely to be hostile to the general interests of the Church as to be favorable? Indeed at the present time the hostility of the Government to the Church and its Head is a fact too notorious to need demonstration. It is requisite that the Head of the Universal Church should be perfectly free from the control of even a Prince favorably disposed towards him, in order that his decrees, whether disciplinary, moral, or dogmatic, may not even be suspected of being influenced by the political exigencies of the state in which he may reside. The welfare of the whole Church depends upon the freedom of its Supreme Head from the interference of any Government. Where would have been that freedom, if the Pope had been the subject of Henry the Eighth when that monarch wished his divorce from Queen Catherine? Where would the Pope's freedom have been in bringing Henry the Second to repentance when he murdered St. Thomas a Becket? Where would it have been if he had been a subject of France when Napoleon wished to establish a French Church as completely under his control as the Church of England is under control of the British Parliament, or the Russian Church under control of the Czar? Where would have been the liberty of the Church when Napoleon demanded a divorce from the injured Josephine? It is needless to say that his liberty would be illusory as that of the Serbian Bishops who only a few months ago were obliged to acknowledge King Milan's right to tamper with and dispense himself from the observance of the laws of God. He is king, forsooth, and therefore not bound by any legal restriction imposed by God or man!

It is to be hoped that, placed in such circumstances, the Head of the Catholic Church would show more independence than did the schismatical Serbian prelates. History tells us that most powerful influences have been in vain brought to bear in the past to obtain from the Popes an assent to the iniquities of kings; but make him the subject of any mundane Sovereign, and his equitable decisions would be the signal for the most violent outrages upon his person.

Here we may remark that it is not necessary for us to dwell upon the Globe's Mark Twain style of belittling the Pope's authority by saying how little "the outside world" knows or cares about the Pope's spiritual functions. There are not two worlds on this domain of Christendom. The inside world is the Catholic Church itself. The "outside world" of which the Globe speaks is but an agglomeration of limited localities. But the Pope's Jubilee, which has only lately terminated, shows that even that "outside world" has been forced to acknowledge its respectful regard for such an authority as that of the Pope. That authority has received respectful consideration, not only from the Protestant rulers, William of Germany, Victoria of England, President Cleveland of the United States, Oscar of Sweden, and the rest, but also from the Czar of Russia, the Mikado of Japan, the Sultan of Turkey, the Shah of Persia, and others whom we need not enumerate. Could we conceive of such testimonies of respect offered to "Bishops Carman and Williams," or to the Moderator of Presbyterianism, either in Canada or elsewhere?

But we are told that as a matter of fact the Pope is really free to-day. The Globe tells us:

"Was the Pope ever more independent, in the true sense of that term, than he is now? The people and Government of Italy respect his independence to the fullest possible extent. They have no wish to interfere with it. And if they had they would be of all fools the greatest if they ever made the attempt. The spiritual head of two hundred millions of people could not be really coerced or confined with impunity. The first attempt in this direction would raise such a general ferment and call forth such a general protest as would make the Italian Government feel what a mistake it had made."

As a matter of fact the attempt has

actually been made, and it has called forth a general protest from the bishops of every country. We do feel confident that the Italian Government will be made to feel the force of this universal protest, and that the result will yet be the Pope's restoration to temporal independence.

But our esteemed contemporary is of opinion that the Pope's liberty has not been assailed at all. If the professions of the Italian law of guarantees were true, the Globe's statement would be correct enough. But they are not true. The first three articles of the Law declare the position of the Pope to be as inviolable as that of the king. The second article declares that any attack directed against the person of the Sovereign Pontiff shall be "punishable with the same penalties as those established in the case of an attack directed against the person of the king." Yet in practice, not only are the infidel newspapers allowed to vilify the Pope and insult him most grossly, but whenever the candle of the city think proper to assemble about the Vatican, and to cry out "Death to the Pope," "Burn the Vatican," they are allowed to do so without interference from the police. The only occasion since 1870 when a Papal procession passed through the streets of Rome, was when the remains of Pope Pius IX. were removed from St. Peter's to be laid at rest in San Loreto. This was on July 13th, 1881. The Government refused the royal honors so plentifully promised in the Law of Guarantees; but this even might be overlooked if they had granted ordinary protection against the rabble; and this the Government promised. At the same time, to this extent the Government interfered with this solemn rite, which was peculiarly a rite of the Church, that it forbade the clergy of the city to take a place in the procession. About 100,000 devout Catholics spontaneously assembled to show honor to the deceased Pontiff, and were it not for their presence, the two or three hundred Garibaldian ruffians who assembled also would have been quite free to have carried out their design which they openly proclaimed, to throw the Pope's corpse into the river Tiber. Without any interruption from the police, these ruffians followed the procession, crying out "death to the Pope: Long live the King: Long live Garibaldi!" Such is the liberty which the Holy Father enjoys in his own city—the city which is lawfully the Church's patrimony.

We might mention many other facts which show the amount of liberty granted to the Pope in his rule over the Church. We will only call attention to one more of these facts at present. Rome, the centre of Catholic unity, has always been the centre of Catholic learning, and surely if the Pope be free to exercise his sacred functions, he should be left in undisputed possession of the means to keep up the Roman institutions of ecclesiastical learning, and he should be undisturbed in the control of the magnificent libraries which are necessary for the education of theologians of the first rank. These libraries have been seized and in many cases scattered and sold by the Italian Government, and the educational institutions have been closed and confiscated in many cases. The Church has been crippled in every way, the clergy have been banished, and the seminaries broken up, so that there are not clergy enough now to meet the necessities of the people.

In fact, so far is our contemporary from having proved that the Pope has no need of temporal independence, that he has rather furnished arguments why the temporal authority should be restored. It acknowledges the justice of the Catholic demand that the "spiritual head of two hundred millions of people be not coerced or confined," (two hundred and fifty millions would be nearer the mark,) then without temporal authority, the Holy Father is both coerced and confined, the only remedy which can correct the evil ought to be applied, that is, the restoration of the temporal power.

It is very true, as the Globe states, that for hundreds of years the Church had no temporal power or earthly patrimony; but after the seat of imperial authority was transferred from Rome to Constantinople, the necessity of a supreme authority in Rome placed the Roman Pontiff on the throne of the city, and thus Providence provided the Church with that independence which, when she became actually spread throughout all nations, was necessary for her welfare. The seizure of Rome was a robbery, so much the more outrageous as it was at the same time a sacrilege. It was not even accomplished by the wish of the Roman people. The revolutionists who sympathized with the robber king were but a small fraction of the population. The Holy Father, then, properly insists upon the restoration of his rights, which are founded upon every principle of justice; and indeed the prosperity of Italy itself requires that the independent position of the Pope should be re-established and recognized.

Socialists are so busy propagating their doctrines among the workmen of Rome that the Government are seriously alarmed. This is but the result which might be expected from the persecution to which the Church is subjected. The State has not the authority to teach doctrine, and it cannot expect to have that influence which will recommend its doctrine to the people. To leave the Church her full liberty in her own sphere would be the proper way to ensure the promulgation of the correct doctrine concerning the rights of property, and the duties of citizens in regard to the State and toward each other.

CHINQUI IN ORILLIA.

We learn from a letter sent us by an esteemed correspondent that poor old Chiniqui lectured last Thursday in Orillia. The town's dead walls were for weeks previous placarded with posters announcing two lectures by "this antiquated apostate." Our esteemed correspondent says: "In the evening about 400 Orangemen, Sons of England and disciples of Calvin, listened to his thread-bare tale of how he and some other cranks left the true Church. Of the door money he pocketed \$60, and by early train next morning cleared out: postponing his second lecture *sine die*. Altogether he met with a cold reception, the more sensible people regretting that he had been invited, since his lecturing could produce no other possible result than to sow the seeds of hatred and bitterness in our midst. Being over seventy years of age and nearing his end, before he has another opportunity of visiting us he may be called away to a region where there is no snow." This latter remark is very uncharitable on the part of our correspondent. We should never despair even of the worst cases of sin or of moral or mental obliquity. God's mercy is wonderfully far-reaching and may vouchsafe the grace of conversion and repentance to the most hardened wretches. The great difficulty apprehended, no doubt, by our correspondent lies in the fact of Chiniqui's apostasy, St. Paul declaring, Heb. vi. 6, that of such rebels against truth and divine grace as Gavriel, Chiniqui and the rest, "it is impossible for them to be renewed again to penance." While there is life there is hope, however, and God's mercy is infinite. The true motto for every Christian should be *ne desperandum*.

On the occasion of the lecture above mentioned a very timely letter was sent to the Orillia Times, and we transfer it to our columns, as forming an interesting chapter in the history of the disturbance and scandals created some thirty years ago by the apostasy of the far-famed Chiniqui. The letter when in holy orders championed the cause of temperance, but, unfortunately, like most other ardent promoters of that cardinal virtue, he went too far in his denunciations of those who did not agree with him. And, like other temperance fanatics, he made all virtue consist in abstaining from the use of alcoholic stimulants. Had he practised other social virtues, no less necessary and even yet more honorable, he would not have fallen under the censure of his ecclesiastical superiors and become a rebel and a renegade from the Church that educated and nurtured him. The letter in the Orillia Times refers to his zeal for Catholic truth while in the ministry; and shows how logically he could argue in favor of the claims of Mother Church, from which he afterwards apostatized, and upon which, for the last twenty years, he has been heaping the vilest and most blasphemous outrages in pulpit and on platform.

A NEW CRUSADE.

One of the most insensate bigots of this fair Province of Ontario is the Inspector of the public schools of Toronto, Mr. J. L. Hughes. He allows no opportunity to pass to throw out insult and contumely upon Catholics, and for this purpose makes use of the vilest means, and associates with the most degraded characters who put in an appearance in Toronto from time to time for the purpose of bespattering Catholics and Catholicity with the filth of calumny. He it was who took the obscene Fulton under his special patronage, and who, by letters to the press, as well as by his presiding at Fulton's lectures, endeavored to induce the Protestant people of Toronto to bring their wives and daughters to the hall wherein Fulton retailed his indecent lies, borrowed, for the most part, from the scandalous writings of Marie Monk and Edith O'Gorman.

We have too much regard for the respectable Protestants of Ontario to resort upon even Mr. Hughes, by recalling to mind the special cases of delinquencies which have occurred among the Protestant clergy, even within the last few months, and which would completely offset the deleterious stories which were related on a Toronto platform last April while Mr. Hughes occupied the chair, even if these stories were true. The immoralities of the Catholic priesthood and the Catholic nuns were the theme of Fulton's discourse on that occasion. They were, however, immoralities of days long past. We might say to the lecturer and the chairman who introduced him to the Protestant public, something like what Mark Twain told the Italian guide who, wishing to show him all the curiosities possible, pointed out the tomb of "Christophoro Colombo, the great discoverer of America." Mark demanded to know, "Is he dead?" And on hearing that he had been dead for nearly four hundred years he told the guide he had no wish to have the corpses of ancient days brought up before him: "but if you have any nice fresh corpses, trot them out." He was quite willing to take a look at them and to pay his conductor in proportion to their freshness. We would recommend

Mr. Hughes to get in a supply of fresh corpses for exhibition before again appealing before the public as a pandering to the depraved appetite which some people have for carion.

We suppose, however, that Mr. Hughes imagines that he has found a real grievance against the Catholics of Ontario and Quebec now, for in the Mail of the 7th inst. there appears a letter under the title, "Canada's Greatest Enemy: Aggressions of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy," which for falsehood and malignity is not surpassed by any of the utterances of Fulton the obscene, though we must acknowledge that on the present occasion Mr. Hughes does not make use of the obscenity of which he is a quondam patron. The same letter appeared in the Globe of the same date, though under less sensational headings.

Mr. Hughes begins by informing the public that the crusade which he is now engaged in preaching through the Dominion of Canada was begun by him over a year ago, so we may judge that his appearance in company with Justin D. Fulton was simply one of the sallies of the campaign. A year ago Mr. Hughes, in company with Rev. Dr. McVicar, President of the Presbyterian College of Montreal, called on Sir William Dawson, and these three worthies discussed together "the unjust aggressiveness of the Roman Catholic hierarchy in regard to educational affairs both in Quebec and Ontario." Mr. Hughes tells the result of these deliberations: "We agreed as to the urgent need of union among Protestants for the protection of their liberties and the preservation of their rights."

The proposition made by Mr. Hughes was that a meeting of leading Protestant ministers and laymen should be called for the purpose of forming an organization to effect the desired union, and to meet the aggressions of Romanism; but on Mr. Dawson's suggestion it was decided that the "Evangelical Alliance" already existing is exactly the organization wanted. Sir William Dawson said: "Your object is perfectly right, but I would suggest a different method of calling the meeting. Why multiply organizations when an organization already exists for this purpose? The Evangelical Alliance is the proper body to move in this matter, and I strongly advise you to await their action." Sir William explained that it was the intention of the Montreal Alliance to extend their operations throughout the Dominion, and to establish a Dominion Alliance. Mr. Hughes says the object of the Alliance is "the very object I had in view. I was delighted. I heartily agreed with the proposal plan, and so did those who had been my co-workers in Toronto."

From all this we learn what the object is which the Evangelical Alliance have in view: to combat the "aggressions of Romanism." This is certainly a pretty euphemism for the objects which the Evangelical Alliance has never pretended to conceal, as the purpose of its existence. There are no aggressions of Romanism, either in Ontario or Quebec, and the only object for which the Alliance exists, and which Principal McVicar, Sir William Dawson, and J. L. Hughes are working is to destroy Catholic education.

We are not alarmists. We have no fears that these doughty heroes will accomplish their purpose. The Catholics of Canada are not in this Dominion by virtue of any tolerance extended to them by the trio who acknowledge that they assembled in Montreal to decide upon the fate of the Catholic Church in this Dominion. These bigots may as well know at once that we do not beg their favor, nor will we endure their tolerance. The Catholics of Canada are an integral part of the Dominion, and on our rights we stand as citizens, equal in every respect to our Protestant fellow-citizens. The trio of whom we have already spoken threaten us with war—no less—unless we accept their dictatorship. The Rev. James Fleck, quoted with approbation by Mr. Hughes, said at a meeting of the Evangelical Alliance, the other day: "An attempt is being made to roll back the tide of history—to reverse the verdict of the Plains of Abraham—and it behooves them as those whose forefathers had won this splendid inheritance. . . as Britons to rally round the old flag, and stand shoulder to shoulder for their rights."

Catholics need only regard with contempt this belligerent talk. We have had occasion in the past to contend with equally determined and far more influential foes than those who are engaged in inaugurating the new crusade. Orangeism was, in its day, a powerful political and religious, or rather irreligious, factor in the politics of Canada. Its war cry was Protestant Ascendancy, but it has ceased to exercise any important influence in the country. The very fact that Sir William Dawson and Mr. Hughes, with the fiery Professor McVicar, deem it necessary to use the Evangelical Alliance as their instrument for the suppression of Romanism, is evidence enough that Orangeism is virtually defunct. The Evangelical Alliance has no better prospect, before it than its more vigorous prototype, should it adopt the same secondhand policy.

But it appears that Mr. Hughes has been already snubbed by the Alliance. Hence in his letter he bitterly complains of the neglect of vigorous measures on

the part of this society. Hon. Senator John Macdonald appointed Dominion President at Montreal meeting, and Mr. Hughes as "delighted" at the prospect that out as he was by his conversation with Sir William Dawson. It was the mind that the whole country was organized to check—what? The "There are a few Jesuits in Canada, perhaps seventy all told, and the Evangelical Alliance are to be toward their suppression! It was the old story of the mountain. But this was only the Montreal programme. Toronto, the centre of Protestantism, was yet to be from, and in Toronto a meeting of the Alliance was held on 28th of Mr. Hughes informs us that at this meeting "every speaker made Romanism chief theme." The Rev. John Rev. Mr. Milligan, Rev. A. C. Rev. Jas. Fleck, and others, clearly enough that "our first Christians is to check the pro-Jesuitism in Canada by securing Protestants." One speaker said "Romanism is placing its heavy schools of the country." It all went had been given in the feelings of these gentlemen, Mr. says that "no attempt was made a membership or organize on a new basis." On the contrary, a large committee of men was appointed, none of whom, except the chairman, were even a member of the Alliance, and the chairman himself declared the speakers at the meeting had gone outside the objects of the Alliance by their manifestation of a "to introduce the anti-Papal crusade meeting."

Altogether, Mr. Hughes thinks Evangelical Alliance does not promise to be a very energetic ally with himself for the suppression of Romanism. He wishes now new vigor into the association. We congratulate the members of the Alliance on their not having the plans, and under the dictation of James L. Hughes. The world's common country is at present view by all classes of citizens, to be attained only by mutual Catholics have no design to education of Protestants either or Quebec, and it is false to say have made any aggressive move this direction. But we do not either, to allow a proselytizing indoctrinate our children with tantism in Protestantized schools. Evangelical Alliance have, as individual members are made manifest their intention to public school programme, the same time to starve the schools out of existence must be made to understand not going to let the control of pass to them, and that even schools are not to be Protestant long as one penny of Catholic to their maintenance.

The Toronto public schools are Protestant, as the Toronto Catholics own Catholic schools. It is most unseemly that their servant, Mr. Hughes, should make such wanton attacks upon as he is in the habit of doing either in Toronto or elsewhere. Dominion have never made a movement as this against tant fellow-citizens. The aggression is, therefore, more for bigots of the J. L. Hughes which endeavor to hide their insane hatred of Catholic Protestants of Toronto may correct to employ a public school to waste the time for which ing him to go around the country in 1886, on a tour, partly and partly political, but they by such means convince their schools are quite unnecessary, therefore, there is no policy to have schools of the will be free from the influence men as Mr. Hughes.

MORE INTOLERANCE.

From the facts which we almost every week it would wave of Protestant intolerance and is working its hateful entire Dominion. Some "Thanksgiving Day, it was later, in Toronto, who a circle of Ireland to the influence He was merited enough to other half to the account. Then the No-Popery cry election to the civic chair in city. A few days later on from the chaplain of the Grand gratulating a few "wild Irish" wild tattooed Indians, on Ireland from Pope and Pope and wooden shoes." This reminded of our physical ferocity by an application Brockville authorities, to for a Chief of Police, and plain terms that the applic