

Brook, Wood West, when the vote was taken, the Rev. Father, De St. George, was present for the night sitting and both sides as the sign- voted for the first between Catholic mem- taken and put in the of the Minister of of Opposition.

ANCE AT THE ATE.

was one of the most absorbing that ever of the public or of the powers of the. The citizens of nation like Canada ashamed of the men in council, and to aspirations in elo- language. Cer- who took part in the of, not interfering tending the Jesuits' in the Quebec Legis- months '89, are common order, and to any assem- in this or any other of arguments of the Jesuits, who did not condemn the for consulting with of constitutional orator who spoke for truth and justice, of facts arrayed to each speaker, of Commons, so called 1888 or fair-play and com- to the much- outed, and ever-mal- Society of Jesus. found sufficiently brazen- their votes g done the Fathers. of exciting ill will, now, we view against them, but and enlightenment publish their names. Bell, Charlton, Cock- McDonald (Huron), McNeil, O'Brien, Wallace, and Tyr- out could be written of the general liber- of the Order, one of the most scholarly and Catholic, of Canadian, Torie- ited to do jus- of men, who, it ed, while benefitting missionary labors scientific and literary the most sturdy of the Order, and the most of the Church and of supremacy.

se in defence of the Sir John Macdonald allow the bill. Mr. able, lucid and inde- which he claimed that man he is not recreant of the Order, one of the most scholarly and Catholic, of Canadian, Torie- ited to do jus- of men, who, it ed, while benefitting missionary labors scientific and literary the most sturdy of the Order, and the most of the Church and of supremacy.

se in defence of the Sir John Macdonald allow the bill. Mr. able, lucid and inde- which he claimed that man he is not recreant of the Order, one of the most scholarly and Catholic, of Canadian, Torie- ited to do jus- of men, who, it ed, while benefitting missionary labors scientific and literary the most sturdy of the Order, and the most of the Church and of supremacy.

they possessed in the colony, of what nature were they, and the said estates shall be preserved in their privileges, rights, honors, and exemptions." It was wrong, therefore, to say that the Jesuits were deprived of their properties. The king of England had no such authority, the law of nations did not give him power to touch one roof of land belonging to the Jesuits. We are told, con- firmed Sir John Thompson, that in the treaty it was stated that the Roman Catholic subjects of Quebec were allowed freedom of worship only so far as the "Act of Supremacy" permitted. But were that Act to be enforced not only the Jesuits, or other priests, but no man in Canada could exercise the duties of his religion. The Act of Supremacy was, therefore, not to be enforced, and, never intended for the colonies, and, therefore, should not be appealed to as an argument against the Jesuits. When the last Jesuit died the lands escheated to the Crown, but should in reality have escheated to the Church, and become the possession of the Head of the Church. The Catholic Church always claimed ownership of these Jesuit estates, because they were donated by private individuals, or by the king of France, for educational and religious purposes; and when an attempt was made by the Government to sell these lands no one could be found to purchase them, so no satisfactory title could be given. There was no remedy for the settlement of the question but by a vote of the Provincial Legislature, and the Quebec Government has unanimously decided to fully satisfy the moral claim which the Church has ever set up to at least part ownership of these estates. And have any right to exercise a superior and over-riding judgment for this Province? Is that the theory upon which our constitution is to be worked out? I say, therefore, that the advice which has been given to His Excellency the Governor General is that "the Legislature of the Province of Quebec is the supreme authority to decide, and had a perfect right to decide without veto or control of authority here, even though we thought they decided erroneously." It is objected that the Pope's name is mentioned in the preamble to the Bill. In the history of the disavowal, and the history of the statute in the Mother Church, I think the records will be searched in vain to find an Act disavowed because the preamble was offensive to anybody. Sir John Thompson here drew an admirable picture of himself telling the Governor General he should advise His Excellency to disallow the Act, because of some article in the London Quarterly Review. His Excellency might ask me a pertinent question that should have been put to Mr. D'Alton McCarthy this evening: "Mr. Minister of Justice, who is the author?" My answer would be, I really do not know, but, Your Excellency, I am quite sure that nothing would be published in the Quarterly Review which would not stand criticism. (Cheers.) I am afraid His Excellency would not be satisfied, and might put me another puzzling question: "Mr. Minister of Justice, are you aware that these able and eloquent, though anonymous publications in the Quarterly Review have been answered time and time again until the slanders have been worn thread bare?" I would like to ask my hon. friend (D'Alton McCarthy) if he has ever seen these answers.

Mr. D. McCarthy—"Where?"

Sir J. Thompson—"He asks me 'where.' Well I will tell him in the first place in publications so voluminous that I shall have to give him a catalogue of them, but in order to be precise I will tell him that in an English publication called the Monthly Step by Step, as every one of those articles came out in the Quarterly Review the answer and refutation were given. If His Excellency should ask me were those answers satisfactory. I should reply it was not for me to say, but the best thing he could do would be to leave it to his own conscience, or that conscience which the constitution has provided for the subject, the Legislature of the Province, which did not do so. (Applause.) Now, Sir, looking back over thirty-seven years, since the incorporation of the Jesuit College in Montreal, can you find a man who could say that the Fathers taught him immorality or anything of the sort? The rules of the constitution of the Jesuit Fathers are published in book form for the last forty-five years, and I cannot lay my hand on one passage of these rules that is objectionable on the ground of public policy how could I advise disallowance? I think that the House will agree with me that two principles must be observed when we are touching on these delicate subjects. One is the matter regarding the theological question; the other matters touching upon the freedom of the people, whether in the humblest and smallest Province or in the great Province of Quebec. (Cheers.)

Sir John Thompson's closely reasoned and eloquent speech of three hours utterly demolished the airy castle built up by the able and forcible harangue of the previous speaker, D'Alton McCarthy, & Co.

The Hon. David Mills defended the Bill, and said he was glad of the opportunity it gave the members to educate the people of Canada on questions of constitutional right, and of historical facts, of which great numbers throughout were totally ignorant. Under pretence of upholding the Constitution they were putting forward a motion asking for the violation of the Constitution, and they were raking up facts and issues of 300 years ago for the respect and confidence of all those who know them. No Presbyterian would now care to have his political views judged by the standard of John Knox. The President of the United States had no power to interfere with State Legislation, and it would be a great abuse of the power of disallowance in this particular case. Hon. Mr. Mills delivered one of the most statesmanlike, the most liberal-minded and scholarly discourses ever made in any Parliament. We cannot withhold our meed of congratulation and of gratitude for this magnificent tribute of genius and ripe scholarship offered by a conscientious and able gentleman of high position to the merits, the sacrifices and the glories of the Jesuit Fathers, as recorded in every unbiased history of their teachings and their works. We hope Mr. Mills as well as Hon. Sir John Thompson's eloquent speeches

on this all absorbing topic will appear in pamphlet form, that all may enjoy the rich and valuable information confined to the more fortunate readers of the daily press.

Sir John A. Macdonald said one would suppose from the speeches we heard that this is a new invasion of the Jesuits, that they come here like the hordes of Genghis and Vandals. So long as thirty-seven years ago a Jesuit College was established in Montreal. I voted for that, Mr. Speaker, and I never had cause to regret it. That institution has gone on in its work of usefulness. We do not hear one complaint of its teachings, of any disloyal doctrines, or doctrines that have brought censure on the head of the college or on its Church. Look at England. Are the people of England afraid of the Jesuit body making insidious attempts to attack the supremacy of the Crown? Are they afraid the queen's crown will tremble on her head? The grandest college in England is conducted by the Jesuits. Why, all the English Catholics, from the Duke of Norfolk down, have been educated there. And no body of men is so loyal to the English Catholics, headed by the Duke of Norfolk. There are 300 Jesuit priests in England and 180 in Ireland. They have charge of several colleges and high schools, and are universally esteemed. And whatever souls may exist in the statutes of Elizabeth are allowed to drop quietly out. No one thinks of them. The other day the Royal Highness the Prince of Wales asked at High Mass offered up for the soul of the late Prince of Wales, and on leaving asked the Jesuit Father who officiated to give him a missal in remembrance of a pious souvenir of the melancholy occasion. Canada is the only country afraid of the Jesuits. But I hope this foolish dread and senseless agitation will soon pass away. I was in England when excitement ran high owing to the attack of Lord John Russell on Cardinal Wiseman. The agitation was so great that the doors on the streets were marked "No Popery." Wherever I went, to theatre or elsewhere, the cry was "God save the Queen" and "Down with the Pope." Well, on that was passed, the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, and it was never put into force, not one single proceeding was taken under that Act, and in 1871 it was repealed in silence.

Hon. Mr. Blake—They were ashamed of it.

Sir John Macdonald—As the Hon. member for West Durham says they were hardly ashamed of it. I hope they will be when this matter is fully understood in Ontario, the country will see that their apprehensions are unfounded, and that the country is safe. Now, Sir, there are seventy-one Jesuit priests in Canada. They are armed with a string of beads and sashes around their waist, and a mass or breviary in their hand. What harm can they do? Are they going to convert all Canada? I met my friend, Dr. Foin (Presbyterian Minister) of Toronto, the other day, when I told him I would match him physically and spiritually against any follower of Ignatius Loyola in the whole Dominion. (Laughter.) The Jesuits claimed that on their restoration they should get back their estates valued at \$2,000,000. Instead of which they are now getting \$180,000. They have no parish in Quebec; they are a teaching body. But out on the frontiers on the bleak coasts of Labrador they suffer most of the miseries which the historian Parkman tells us they have ever been ready to suffer for Christianity. (Cheers.) All this cry, Mr. Speaker, is for \$180,000, which at 4 per cent, means \$6,000 a year. I cannot at this point but remember the story of the Jew, who went into an eating house, and was seduced into partaking of a slice of ham. When he came out it so happened that there was a tremendous crash of thunder. This startled the Jew, and led him to exclaim: "Good Heavens, what a row about a little bit of pork!" (Roar of laughter.) This agitation is all about a little bit of pork. And as the poor Jew escaped being crushed by the thunder I have no doubt Canada will escape from the enormous loss of \$6,000 a year. This subject is not a new one. Years ago the subject was discussed in Parliament and strong arguments used against the feeling of the Opposition was exemplified in a sentence of one good old honest Grit. He used to say: "Mr. Speaker, I don't like them any Jesuits." (Laughter.) I can only repeat that the Government would have performed an act of tyranny if they had disallowed the Act, and no Government could be formed in Canada for the disallowance of such a measure. Were such possible that would be the consequence? Agitation, a quarrel, religious feuds and factions. Our credit would be ruined abroad. Annual observances would be destroyed at home. I cannot sufficiently picture in my faint language the feeling I have of the misery, the wretchedness that would be heaped upon Canada if this question, after being agitated as it has been agitated, were to be decided in the disallowance of the measure. (Loud and prolonged cheers.)

Never do we suppose in the history of the Jesuit Fathers were such eloquent tributes paid to their meritorious works, or such well-merited encomiums passed on their mission, their motives and their labors by men holding the high positions of Hon. D. Mills, Sir J. Thompson and Sir John Macdonald as were listened to with breathless attention in Canada's Commons on Wednesday, Thursday and Friday of last week. No doubt the debate itself, and the glorious result of the debate, was a death-blow to the bigotry excited by the furious articles of the Toronto Mail and the forgeries of Dr. Wild and Goldwin Smith. The Jesuits will have sense enough, as the whole country will have sense enough, to profit by it.

A RETALIATION ACT.

The bigots of this Province were overwhelmingly defeated by the vote taken in the House of Commons on last Thursday evening. Of all the Provinces that make up this grand Dominion only two voted against the Act of the Quebec Legislature on the Jesuits' Estates Bill. Ontario gave twelve votes and Quebec one, that of Mr. Siriver. It is very remarkable that the representatives of all the other Provinces voted with the Government. British Columbia, the North-West Territories, Manitoba, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island all voted one solid vote for justice and fairly to the Jesuit Fathers, and for freedom to make laws for Quebec. It has been decreed then and decided by a unanimous vote in the House of Commons that henceforth the Province of Quebec is free to make laws without submitting them to Goldwin Smith or to the Toronto Mail for approval. It has also been promulgated that Messrs. Morier and Co. when about to legislate for the well-being of their Province shall not be compelled to first ask leave of Dr. Wild, Dr. Hunter and of all the other ignorant fanatics who are imposing on the credulity of their audiences and striving to raise civil war in Ontario. This has been all decided in Ottawa and the Toronto Globe, the Mail and our Toronto respectable Free Press may just as well commence now to enter on the path of peace, and bury the hatred of religious warfare and intolerance which they have been waging now too long. Retaliation has commenced in London. The vote given in Ottawa on the 28th March has already been off set by a vote given in our city here last Monday evening. It was decided to make a retaliatory attack on five old women. Fortunately the five old women have friends to fall back on, and can defy the bigoted assaults of the Big Men and stalwart braves who, on last Monday evening, issued forth in their war-paint to pounce upon the feeble old ladies in their wigwag at Mount Hope Orphan Asylum. Vengeance is mine, saith the Lord. But, for the time being, bigotry is lord in the London Council and its Mayor hath said: Vengeance is mine. If I cannot scalp a live Jesuit I shall flourish my tomahawk in the pale faces of five old women at Mount Hope Orphan Asylum. In all seriousness we ask our readers to take charge of them. The good Sisters accepted the charge, and have been remunerated by the city at the rate of fifty cents each per week. Food, clothing, comfortable rooms, gas light, steam heat, all the consolations of the religion they believe in and cherish in their hearts were daily furnished to these miserable old ladies who are to be deprived them of all these comforts, and consign them henceforth to the tender mercies of the proselytizing ladies who are no doubt well able and well fitted to take care of their own, but who have no aptitude or calling for ministering to the comforts of poor old ladies who were born and have been brought up in the good old Catholic faith. The following is a synopsis of what Bishop Walsh said on the subject in the Cathedral at High Mass last Sunday, which we copy as given in the London Advertiser of last Monday's issue:

"After preaching the usual sermon yesterday, Bishop Walsh made the following remarks: 'My dear friends, it is not often that I am called upon to speak to you concerning our relations to the city, but something appeared in the papers yesterday that I think requires a word or two of explanation. It is stated that we have been getting an annuity or yearly donation from the city. Now, the facts of the case are as follows: In 1862, when Mr. Beecher was mayor, there were five old women in the hospital kept at the expense of the city. It was suggested that they be taken up to Mount Hope and attended by the Sisters, which was done. These women have been kept clothed, fed and provided with a comfortable home, their spiritual wants attended to; in fact, their last few steps towards the grave have been made as comfortable as they possibly could be, and all the Sisters got for this is the small sum of \$1 per week each. Surely no man will say there is much profit in that. On the contrary, I can say there was a direct loss. Now it is proposed to drag these poor old women away and put them in some Protestant institution. I am not sure if it has any thing else to recommend it, but this I am sure of. These old women are not going to be dragged away from Mount Hope. They are there now, and there they will remain, and be supported, if need be, by the charity of our own people. This is the history of the whole matter, and there I leave it for the present.' The correspondent goes on to say certain persons succeeded last January in raising what was known as the 'Protestant' feeling themselves by causing no little ill-feeling between Catholics and Protestants, which very many thoughtful people on both sides regretted, but even those who regretted it most thought it would soon blow over. It had done its errand in the matter of getting those elected that without it would never have warranted an official seat, and here it was expected to die out or lie idle, like some old state gar-

ment—till it should suit the occasion to don it once more. But it would seem that these hopes are not to be realized. One man distinguished himself very much on the night of the election, when he knew he was elected, and when he could afford to be generous, by calling his Catholic fellow-citizens in a public speech 'miserable scoundrels of a miserable sect.' Next the official guttlesome was set in motion, and the heads of Messrs. Boyle and Burke fell into the basket. Now it is proposed to 'carry the war into Africa,' and attack the five poor old women that are being kept and cared for by the Sisters of St. Joseph for a dollar a week. There is just one hope left to those who would like to see the inhabitants of this fair city continue to live on in the future, as they have always lived in the past, viz., in harmony, unity, Christian charity, and brotherly love, and that hope is that this thing is almost sure to be overdone, that the good sense of the people will come to the rescue and sit on this thing once for all by sending bigots and bullies back into their native element, where their opportunities to do harm will be on a par with their ability or inclination to do good."

A MASTERPIECE OF AUDACITY.

The Toronto Globe, in commenting on the debate in the Commons of Canada on the Jesuits' Estates Act, states that Sir John Thompson's speech was "in part a masterpiece of reasoning, in part a masterpiece of audacity, and on the whole a masterpiece of audacity." How, then, can the writer in the Globe object to the conclusions that necessarily flow from such forcible arguments? Sound reasoning, seasoned with discriminating causticity and boldness of expression and manner born of conviction, must always have a powerful influence in determining an intelligent audience to embrace truth and sanction justice. Causticity is a powerful weapon in the hands of one who knows how to use it with discretion and at the proper moment. Only those who never act consistently and are afraid of being held down to principle make any objection to the use of causticity, which Webster's dictionary informs us, is the "science of determining the lawfulness or unlawfulness of what a man may do." It was the solid reasoning, forcible arguments, and penetrating subtlety of discrimination, or causticity, if you will, that rendered the speech of Hon. J. Thompson the towering speech of this ever-memorable session, and that places him in the very foremost rank of Canada's parliamentary orators.

The Globe accuses his speech of "audacity." Boldness or confidence is one of the necessary results of honest conviction; and while limited, as in the case of Hon. J. Thompson, to self defence from outside and uncalculated interference, cannot be styled "audacity" except in the very best sense of the word. If it be "audacity" to uphold one's sacred and vested rights, by what term shall we designate the conduct of the Globe, in denouncing the Province of Quebec; in lecturing the Catholics of Ontario on the attitude they should assume in regard to the head of their Church, and in laying down false principles for the guidance of the whole Liberal party of the entire Dominion. And in what terms ought we to characterize the conduct pursued by the Protestant preachers and the ministers of the Gospel in every town and city of this Province during the last three months? All the monster meetings, all the indignation excursions, all the alliances and Evangelical associations, called together in pavilions, city halls and church vestries for the ostensible purpose of terrorizing Sir John Macdonald and his ministry into voting down the Jesuit Fathers and annulling the Act of the Legislature. What is all this but "audacity" in the very worst sense of the word? And while from the sacred pulpit and the public platform those self-styled dispensers of the gospel of peace were hurling anathemas against the unfeeling Jesuits, and working up their audiences into hatred and dread, bordering on madness, of the followers of St. Ignatius, there was not a single counter-meeting held or a voice raised in the Province of Quebec.

Was it not the extreme of audacity for the Evangelical Alliance to hold its aggressive assembly in Montreal, the heart of French Canadian Catholicity, and there plot, plan and devise the annihilation of the Catholicity that gave them shelter and protection? But in all soberness let us ask our Protestant readers, of whom we ask no boast many and respectable ones, what would happen were the case reversed? Let us suppose one hundred or more priests from the Lower Province assembled in Toronto, and there, in conjunction with some Basilean and Jesuit Fathers, heads of colleges like Dr. McVicar, and secular clergymen from all parts of Ontario, holding council in some public hall, and consulting with each other as to the most effective measures to be taken for the destruction of Protestantism, would there not be a general uprising, and a universal shout of indignation at the "audacity of this Popish plot?" Would not all the smoking and snuffing incendiary articles on Papal Aggression, Assumption of Rome, Protestantism in Danger, etc., and would not Rev. Dr. Wild be found some dark evening at the head of a mob, flourishing his "shillelagh" and urging on his Orange followers to riot and vandalism. We are very certain such an assemblage would not be long lived, and those who composed it would be condemned, even by their own adherents, as guilty of the most unpardonable imprudence in exposing themselves uselessly to outrage, and the city to lawlessness. Yet this is what the preachers expose themselves to in Montreal, who assemble there periodically with the avowed purpose of devising means for the annihilation of the Catholic religion. Audacity! I repeat, which distinguish heresy from the one TRUE CHURCH.

THE MAIL ON HISTORY.

Referring to the debate on the Jesuits' Estates Act the Mail calls Mr. Rykert to account for quoting the historian Parkman in praise of the Jesuits, and says that Mr. Rykert was not fair, whereas he did not quote another passage from Parkman in which this historian speaks ill of the same order. The substance of what Parkman says may be summed up in the concluding words of the passage which the Mail fluntings before the eyes of its readers: "No religious order has ever united in itself so much to be admired, and so much to be detested." Parkman, like many other Protestant historians, has been misled against the Jesuit order by the almost irresistible flood of calumny which has been directed against them. The passage in full as quoted by the Mail is itself sufficient evidence that Parkman speaks from prejudice. It is as follows:

"The Jesuit was, and is, everywhere—in the school room, in the library, in the cabinets of princes and ministers, in the huts of savages, in the tropics, in the frozen north, in India, in China, in Japan, in Asia, in America; now as a Christian priest, now as a soldier, a mathematician, an astronomer, a Brahmin, a Mandarin, under countless disguises, by a thousand arts, luring, persuading, or compelling souls into the fold of Rome. Of this vast mechanism for guiding and governing the minds of men, this mighty engine for the subduing the earth to the domination of the Pope, this harmony of contradictions, this moral Proteus, the faintest sketch must suffice. A disquisition on the Society of Jesus would be without end. No religious order has ever united in itself so much to be admired, and so much to be detested."

"The Jesuit is everywhere." For what purpose? Does not the historian himself say that he is everywhere to teach religion, as a Christian priest, and science, as a man of learning? Is it likely that he would thus sacrifice himself in "the huts of savages, in the tropics, in the frozen north, in India, China, Japan and Africa" if he had not the hope of the Christian's reward? And if he labors with such an aim, in view, is he likely to be so unkind in his attitude as his enemies represent?

It is true that some fanatics, whose principles aimed at the destruction of society, have sometimes exhibited an astonishing zeal in the propagation of their principles, even at the risk of life; but the character of the Jesuit, even as this historian has painted it, is not that of a fanatic, such as are the Anarchists of America, or as were the Anabaptists of Germany in the sixteenth century.

The Jesuits are acknowledged, even by the historian in question, to be learned in science, and skilful in Christian theology. We know besides, from their daily life that they meditate deeply every day on the saving truths of religion, and on their duties as Christians. Is it possible, then, that they should be as their enemies paint them, men, men of low morality?

But of what are they guilty, really, according to the historian? Examine the passage which is the Mail's bugaboo, and see in what consists their terrible crime. It is that they "lure, persuade, or compel" souls into the fold of Rome. The conclusion part is an invective of the Jesuits. All who know their real history know that it is a fabrication, but we will acknowledge, that they have been guilty of "luring and persuading" souls to accept the true faith. St. Paul did the same, and he declares that to gain souls to God he became "all things to all men." We do not suppose it will be said that St. Paul did wicked things in order to gain the wicked, but he accommodated himself to the various circumstances in which he found himself in various countries. Perhaps the Jesuits have done the same. It is not long since the Mail and other Canadian journalists poured forth their laudations on the devoted Salvatorians who went to Indian, resolved to adopt the heathen Pagan nation to Christianity. We should thus be praiseworthy in Salvationists, but worthy of execration in Jesuits!

But there is a difference between the cases. The Jesuits aimed at making their converts consistent Catholics, instead of making them contributors to enrich General Booth, or instead of bringing them over to one of the many forms of hydra-headed Protestantism. Perhaps there might be some excuse for them in the fact that as scholars and legislators—for a learned order they are acknowledged to be—they could not persuade themselves that all the forms of Protestantism, from the Rationalism of Germany to the Ritualism of England, are equally true. Yet an advertisement might concede that they were likely to gain souls to Christ by teaching a consistent Christian doctrine, than if they taught that a prayerless Christianity such as the Mail advocated last summer, and a prayerful Christianity, such as the now ministerial allies of the Mail inculcated, are equally pleasing to God.

The Jesuits have been, undoubtedly, successful missionaries in China, Japan, America, and Africa; and this is the very sore point with their calumniators. It is for this that all the efforts of Infidels and evildoers in Europe were aimed at the destruction of the order, and it is for this that they are hated by bigots in Ontario. We are gratified to find that the calumnies which have been heaped upon them by the Mail and its reverend co-workers in the cause of falsehood have scarcely found an echo in the halls of the Dominion Commons. This speaks well for the intelligence of our Canadian Legislators, even for those who are most hostile to the Quebec Act. It shows that they are at least above being influenced by calumny, though they may yield to more popular clamor which those misrepresentations excite.

It is almost needless to add that his historian Parkman's statement that Jesuits are accustomed to pass themselves as astrologers, Brahmins, Mandarins, are equally false with the calumnies of the Mail. Harmless disguises they have worn, where a price was put upon their heads, as in India, and not so very long since, where it was a capital offence for a Jesuit, or in fact for any priest, to be found, but it is utterly false that Jesuits or other priests of the Catholic Church are wont

to practice hypocrisy in furthering the interests of religion.

The evident antipathy of Parkman to the Jesuits makes his testimony to the excellence of their work and their spirit of self-sacrifice the more valuable, as it is evidently a reluctant tribute which the force of truth compels him to pay to them. Parkman's testimony is that "the works of these early Canadian Jesuits attest the earnestness of their faith and the intensity of their zeal. But it was a zeal bridled, curbed, and reined by a guiding hand. Their marvellous training in equal measures kindled enthusiasm and controlled it, raised into action a mighty power, and made it subservient as those great material forces which modern science has learned to awaken and to govern."

Mr. Rykert further adverted to the fact that Lord Macaulay also pays a tribute to their zeal in the cause of religion, and their indefatigable labor as missionaries, and states that they published whole libraries on all conceivable subjects. Lord Macaulay, too, endeavors to lessen the force of his favorable words by blackening their character as teachers of morality; but he informs us on what grounds he makes this injurious statement. It is taken entire from Fra Paolo, an angry and mendacious monk, who, being disappointed in his ambitious schemes of ecclesiastical preferment, took out his revenge by reviling the Catholic Church, and especially the Jesuits, to whom clear-sightedness was child's play, at least in Paolo's estimation, that he was not promoted to a position he was not worthy to occupy. Both Macaulay and Parkman, in praising the Jesuits' work, attest facts which are patent to all who have even cursorily noted the operations of the order, but attributing to these material successes they have their accusations on unreliable authorities who are animated by the spirit of hate and spleen.

THE FREE PRESS.

Our contemporary seems bent on keeping up the religious excitement of the past few weeks and shows a decided unwillingness to lay down the tomahawk, and smoke once more the calumet of peace. When quoting some of the remarks with which Father Teefy prefaced his charity sermon last Sunday evening in Toronto, why was the very best part of it left out? Here is what Father Teefy said, and what every minister who makes any pretence of preaching the gospel of peace should say. We copy from the Globe:

"Certain people who professed not only Christianity, but who were leaders of Christianity, might wish to continue the fight; but on the part of the Catholics of the archdiocese of Toronto he would say that they wished to live in charity and peace with all the community. The cause of the Jesuits was the cause of all true sons of the Roman Catholic Church. The Jesuits ask no privileges; but they rested on their rights, and in the name of God he asked that charity should reign amongst us. The city of Toronto was the political, educational and commercial centre of Canada, and it is not right that it should be the centre of fanaticism. Instead of kindling the firebrand of bigotry and intolerance the torch of charity should be lighted and spread from village to village and from hamlet to hamlet throughout the Province of Ontario. Those who wish to continue this fight should make no mistake. Long after they had smothered Confederation pieces, long after Annexation had ceased to be expected, long after Imperial Federation had ceased to be a dream, the Catholic Church would send forth its Jesuits, its Franciscans, its Basilians, with the same doctrine, the same zeal and the same vigor with which she is sending them forth to-day, when such unkind things are said of them."

The Free Press, in its comment, has nothing to say of Father Teefy's allusion to Imperial Federation, but would make believe that the rev. gentleman hinted at the possibility of annexation, a trick all too unworthy of the journal with a character for respectability such as the London Free Press did once enjoy.

In the same article another instance of bigotry is seen in its comments on Mr. Colby's word "nauseous" in connection with the introduction of the Pope's name in the preamble to the Jesuits' Estates Act. Why did not the Free Press refer its readers to their pacific and honest expressions of Mr. Colby, who certainly is as good a specimen of a Protestant gentleman as the writer of this Free Press can even pretend to be? In the course of his speech on the Jesuits' Estates Bill Mr. Colby said: He could speak from experience, and he would tell the House and the country that the Protestants and Catholics of Quebec Province live together happily, respecting each other's rights and sensibilities, working together for what they believe to be the common good of all. (Cheers.)

The Protestants of Quebec acknowledge this as a fact, that there never was a minority treated in any country with more justice, with more liberality, with more generosity than the Protestant minority of the Province of Quebec. They have always had control of their own school matters, just as much as if they had the entire legislation to the province. They have not been conscious of being in the minority, not at all, not under any circumstances that I have known of. (Loud cheers.)

These words should have been reported by the Free Press for the benefit of its readers, who should have been told to go and do likewise with the Catholic minority of Ontario. Quite a contrary course is now pursued by the Free Press, the Toronto Mail and Globe, which papers are advocating with some preachers the necessity of altering the constitution so that the Catholic minority should be deprived of the luxury of educating their own children in their own Catholic separate school.