

word, if policy be based on Christian principles it will be Christian, and its legislation will be conformable to the laws of God, that is to say, it will contribute to the glory of God and the salvation of souls. If, on the other hand, it is based on the errors and heresies adopted by anti-Christian sects as political principles, then we shall have an erroneous or heretical policy, drawing inspiration from the evil spirit of the sects, and constituting one of the strongest temptations for many minds unacquainted with the discovery of sophistry and the examination of the motives lying at the bottom of political action. If we look at the question from this point of view we must either deny the Catholic priesthood the very mission for which it has been instituted, or avow that it has not only the power, but that often, too, there rests on it the obligation to take a part, and no insignificant one either—in view of the nature of its sacred ministry, Jesus Christ having commanded His Apostles to teach the doctrine of salvation to all, including political rulers and political writers—in the discussion of questions of public policy. It is the Pope for the whole Church, and the bishops for their respective dioceses, in due subordination, of course, to the Sovereign Pontiff, who are the leaders and guides of clergy and people as to their political duties, action, and responsibility. Upon them rests the duty of separating the sound grain from the chaff, or, in other words, discerning the Catholic principles on which Catholic policy is based from the anti-Catholic principles and errors, the groundwork of heterodox policy. If the Pope and the Bishops may not teach that which is Catholic doctrine, of what use are they? If they do not define that which is truth and point out that which is error, who will do it?

Wherefore it is that when the development of the principles which serve as a basis for public policy gives rise to diverse consequences and diverse applications, to the Church it pertains to decide which of these consequences or applications are to be adopted—which may be tolerated, and under what circumstances, and which, too, must be combated.

Mgr. Aguilar then goes on to show that even when a policy is truly Christian, the statesmen who make professions of Catholicism must be submissive to the Pope and to the Bishops in all that regards the character of the means employed in its execution, and this *ratione peccati*, according to the words of Innocent III. and Boniface VIII. He then adds: It might happen that in this regard as in other things the Bishop, whom his dignity does not make infallible or inpeccable, might be deceived or fall into error, but it does not pertain to his inferiors to judge him, still less defame him. They must have recourse to his ecclesiastical superiors, even, if that be necessary, to the Sovereign Master and Supreme Judge, in whom resides infallibility and the right of final judgment. It is thus clear what value must be placed by Catholics on these phrases often repeated as axioms: "The clergy must not meddle in politics; the Bishops as such have nothing to do in politics; the Bishops are not to be obeyed in matters of a political character. When the Bishop issues an order bearing on political matters it may not be discussed but neither must it be obeyed." And so on. Educated people who express themselves in this way do not assuredly reflect on the grave conflict to which the faithful and Christian society generally would be exposed every time ecclesiastical authority decided that some certain question reputed by the leaders of civil life, as exclusively pertaining to politics, really affected the honor due to God and the salvation of souls and was therefore a spiritual question. Were there not in the world an authority superior to conflicting political claims, how could the difficulty in such cases be solved? If the judgment of ecclesiastical authority must in case of doubt or conflict be preferred and followed, the phrases above cited are, to say the least, too absolute and lead to erroneous interpretations. If indeed a statesman or public writer were to persist in his opinion against that of the Church, he would not act as a Catholic, and Catholics could not follow him. Mgr. Aguilar also sets forth in his important letter the Catholic theory on the forms of government, while as to the person or persons exercising the supreme authority in every country he writes: It pretends base their claims on a hereditary title or one supposed to be such, the question, although very grave, because there is doubt as to who should be the head of civil society, does not leave the limits of a litigation whose termination rests with the juriconsults, after a study of the various pieces of evidence submitted. Rarely, however, are litigious conflicts of this character treated or solved by the ordinary procedure of justice. What ordinarily occurs in such circumstances, after the testimony of history, is that each pretender makes abstraction of tribunals, and seeks to

procure a majority of suffrages, but they nearly always have recourse to war, concluding after many calamities by a victory of brothers over brothers, or by an arrangement which might with profit have been adopted in the beginning. The Church not having, as such, any part in these conflicts, endeavors to respect every body, by preaching to all equally moderation and counselling all alike to peace, unless the contestants oblige her, by reprehensible conduct, to exercise the right of admonition and of censure, which wherever morals are concerned, in all cases, belongs to her. The eminent political concludes by saying that it is quite natural that the clergy should form opinions on the questions above mentioned, and that they have the right of expressing these opinions and assuring their adoption by their fellow-countrymen. But, in fact, priests abstain from this course not to expose their dignity to the intrigues of parties and not to compromise in favor of any partisan interest the good things of a superior order. There are not many other periods of history, says Mgr. Aguilar, wherein the Bishops and priests have generally, in practice, renounced as they do to day their indisputable right to political intervention in the interests of religion. Rarely, too, in modern annals, could be less founded than now the charge that they meddle too much in politics. It is, however, well to understand, and to have all Catholics bear it in mind, that according to the dictates of good sense, and to the lucid exposition of right and duty made by Mgr. Aguilar, circumstances may occur wherein the Bishops and their clergy, following in this regard laudable and salutary examples, would be forced to quit their delicate reserve, not only as citizens, but as pastors of souls, and take measures of an extraordinary character to save the faithful from grave perils and the state from utter ruin.

**BISHOP WALSH'S PASTORAL VISITATION.**

For three weeks and more, His Lordship the Bishop of London has been on foot throughout his extensive diocese, blessing and dedicating new churches, stimulating sound religious progress by his presence and good counsel, administering the sacred rite of Confirmation to those worthily disposed for its reception, and everywhere keeping the interests of Holy Church in the foreground of his thoughts. Intelligent Protestants view with admiration the Bishop of London's tireless zeal in the cause of his Master, they note with hearty gratification the success which crowns his administration, for to them he is estimable not alone as a man of culture and of talent, but as a worthy Christian Bishop. In evidence of this fact we need but cite the notices of His Lordship's visit to Simcoe on Rosary Sunday last, which appeared in the British Canadian newspaper, edited and published there by Mr. W. Wallace, ex-M. P. Said the *Canadian* of Oct. 6th: "The Roman Catholic Church in this town was formally opened and blessed on Sunday last. The ceremony was performed by His Lordship Bishop Walsh, of London, assisted by Rev. Dean Murphy of Seaford, Rev. Dr. Kilroy of Stratford, Rev. Father Flannery of St. Thomas, and the resident Priest the Rev. Father Dillon. High mass was celebrated, Dean Murphy officiating, His Lordship reading the Epistle and Gospel of the day. Before proceeding with the services prepared for the occasion His Lordship briefly congratulated the members of the congregation on the completion of their handsome church, and thanked the Protestant friends who by their contributions have kindly aided in its erection. The life of Christ was the subject selected by His Lordship for consideration, and although he felt that human language was utterly inadequate to describe the beauty, sweetness and holiness of that life, he was listened to with marked attention, as with earnestness he traced the history of that life from birth to death, and portrayed the holiness of Christ's character and the sacrifice he had made for the salvation of fallen man. His Lordship makes no effort at oratory, but is an earnest, impressive and pleasing speaker, who evidently trusts to the power of his teaching; rather than to his words, to carry conviction to the hearts and minds of his hearers. We regret that we cannot give even a brief outline of His Lordship's sermon. The services in the evening were conducted by Dean Murphy and Dr. Kilroy, the latter gentleman preaching the sermon. The audiences at both services were large, and the contributions to the building fund were, we understand, upwards of two hundred dollars; we have not learned the exact sum. The church is a handsome and substantial edifice built of red brick. It is of the Norman style of architecture; the main building is 74 by 55 feet, its total length, including the apse and vestry is 100 feet; the tower is 12 feet square, and tower and spire is 73 feet high. Over the main entrance and on each side of it there are handsome painted and stained glass windows. Above and in rear of the altar there is a beautiful circular painted glass window; the other windows are of plain glass. The walls inside are painted to imitate stone. There is a neat and commodious gallery at the south end of the building for the choir and organ. The sanctuary is at the north end, and is spanned by a large arch with the altar in the centre, with a smaller one at the right and left of it. The altars are all painted white and gold, and in addition to these sacred belongings were beautifully decor-

ated with flowers. The seats are commodious, substantial and stylish, and the church is capable of containing comfortably an audience of 500. The windows were all the gifts of members of the congregation, chiefly of the ladies and their friends, and the names of the givers are painted on them. The church is a credit to the congregation, an ornament to the town, and the crosses on its highest points denote to whom it belongs. In a previous issue, that of Sept. 22nd, the same journal had the following: Owing to the heavy rainstorm on Sunday morning the opening ceremonies of the new Roman Catholic Church in this town were postponed for two weeks, until Sunday, 3rd Oct. His Lordship Bishop Walsh, Dean Murphy of Seaford, Rev. Dr. Kilroy, of Stratford, Rev. Father Flannery, of St. Thomas, and the Priest of the Parish, Rev. Father Dillon, were all present and joined in the morning services of that church. Mass was celebrated by Dean Murphy, and His Lordship, instead of delivering the sermon he had prepared made some extempore reflections on the Gospel of the day. The relations of man to his God as his Creator, Father, Master and Redeemer were clearly set forth and urged upon his hearers with scriptural authority; he showed the impossibility of serving two masters with interests so antagonistic as God and the world, and besought all to choose the better part. He dwelt upon the utter worthlessness of the world in comparison with the soul, which was immortal and eternal and was the link that bound man to God, while by the body he was attached to the earth. His reflections were based upon gospel truths and uttered with an earnestness of manner and in language simple so as to be easily understood, and yet with a power so great that he could not fail to arrest the attention of all who heard. However much men may differ from each other in their opinions, as to the forms of its worship, no man claiming to be a Christian could dissent from the teaching of His Lordship last Sunday morning. If there was less prejudice and more community of feeling between the different religious denominations it would be better for humanity, and religion would make more rapid progress. Sectarian strife has been a great barrier to the advancement of the religion which teaches men to love one another, and to do unto others as they would that others should do unto them. Sect in religion, like partyism in politics, sometimes works a vast amount of evil. Both may be useful, both may be good; but both to achieve the greatest amount of usefulness and good must be confined within proper and legitimate limits. Sect and party must both succumb to right, or both may become the greatest tyrants and may inflict the most cruel wrongs on all who do not agree with them. In the past they have done so, and it is only the spread of a Christian intelligence liberating men's minds and giving them a better knowledge of their duties to each other and a more sincere desire to discharge them that will prevent sect and party from again becoming monstrous evils. At the present moment in this country there are evidences of impending evil which can only be averted by the toleration and moderation of the people and the wisdom of those who are guiding its destinies. A rash act may kindle a flame of discord, the evil consequences of which may be felt for generations. What the country requires just now is patriots; of patriots it has more than enough."

On Tuesday, Oct. 4th, His Lordship left Simcoe, accompanied by the Rev. Father Dillon, for St. Thomas, where he was joined by the Rev. Father Flannery, of that city, and the Rev. Father Coffey, of London. With these latter two gentlemen, His Lordship proceeded to Amherstburg, an old, important and populous parish in the extreme west of the diocese. From the good Basilian fathers and the people of St. Thomas, His Lordship received a right joyous welcome. The whole town seemed to have turned out in honor of the occasion, and the church, during the Benediction of the Most Holy Sacrament, celebrated upon His Lordship's arrival, was filled to its utmost capacity. A large confirmation class had been prepared at Amherstburg by the Rev. Fathers Ryan and Brennan, who have the mission in charge. Having duly satisfied himself of their worthiness for the reception of the sacrament, the Bishop on Wednesday morning, Oct. 5th, administered that sacred rite to 139 candidates. The celebrant of the Mass on the occasion was the Rev. Father O'Connor, U. S. B., Sandwich, and the other clergy present, from a distance were Very Rev. Dean Wagner, Windsor, Fathers Flannery, St. Thomas, and Coffey, London. His Lordship prefaced the administration of the sacrament by a telling and impressive exhortation adapted to the wants and dangers of young and old. After Confirmation the Bishop administered the papal benediction and the touching ceremonial was then in Amherstburg brought to a close. In the afternoon, the Bishop, with the accompanying clergy, proceeded to McGregor, a thriving village on the C. P. R., nine miles east of Amherstburg. This village is the centre of a flourishing Catholic mission of over one hundred and fifty or more families, in charge of the Rev. Father Schneider, a zealous and devoted young priest. Here the Bishop, in the presence of a large congregation, on Thursday morning administered confirmation to 52 persons, all well prepared for the sacrament. His Lordship addressed the children and parents in the French language for some time, with a fluency, readiness and force which delighted his hearers. He was followed by the Rev. Father Flannery, St. Thomas, also in French, in a well reasoned and instructive sermon. He showed that the great dangers to which men were exposed were feebleness, ignorance and forgetfulness of God. From Colchester the Bishop went to Windsor, and on Saturday, the 9th, directed his steps to Sandwiche, where he was met by the Rev. Father O'Connor, President of Assumption College, and the faculty of the institution. This college, one of the leading houses of education in the coun-

try, is beautifully situated on the banks of the River Detroit, two miles from the great city of that name, and little more than a mile from the flourishing Canadian town of Windsor. It is in point of location the most favored institution of learning that we know of, and in respect of every other qualification in which such an institution should excel Sandwiche College is keeping well abreast with the times, and doing noble service to religion and to country. The Rev. Father O'Connor, its President, is specially endowed with the qualities required for the good government of so large an institution. The friends of Catholic education in this Province justly look with pride as well on his services in this good cause, as on the success these services have already met with. On Sunday morning, at seven o'clock, His Lordship paid to the dignity of the priesthood the Rev. Thomas J. Hayden, C. S. B., brother of the Rev. Father Ferguson, the brilliant professor of eloquence in Assumption College. This solemn ceremony took place in the College Chapel in presence of the students and faculty of the college. His Lordship was assisted by the Rev. Father O'Connor, President of the College, and the Rev. Father Coffey, editor of the *Catholic Record*. The young priest, at the close of the ceremony, administered his first blessing to the students. On Monday morning His Lordship administered confirmation in the Parish Church of Sandwiche, formerly the Cathedral Church of this diocese, to 80 candidates, diligently prepared by the Rev. Father Aboulin, C. S. B., the indefatigable rector of the parish. Here again His Lordship addressed the congregation in French, exclaiming if possible his former efforts by greater fluency and increased force of expression. From Sandwiche the Bishop directed his steps to Racine River, another French parish, of which the Rev. Father Lydon, a very zealous and successful priest, is curé. The Bishop here again spoke in French and gave confirmation to 110 persons. At Stoney Point the Bishop likewise confirmed 113 candidates, and at St. Francis, in the Township of Tilbury, he confirmed 100 persons, all of whom were highly delighted with His Lordship's suavity of manner in dealing with them, but with his readiness of speech in their own beautiful tongue, so well adapted to conveyance of the sacred truths of religion. His Lordship did not reach home till Thursday night, the 14th inst. On Saturday, after one brief day's rest, he was again on foot this time to preside at the ceremony of blessing the corner-stone of the new church in Chatham, a full report of which ceremony appears elsewhere in this issue. In the morning at 7 o'clock His Lordship administered confirmation in the convent chapel, to seven candidates, making 589 persons in all confirmed since Rosary Sunday.

**THE KINGSTON "DAILY WHIG" AND THE LORD BISHOP OF KINGSTON.**

A Kingston newspaper and would-be friend, the *Daily Whig*, again attacks the Most Reverend Bishop of Kingston, and in his wrath pours forth most insolent aspersions upon the whole Irish nation, because of His Lordship's address at our Home Rule meeting held in the City Hall eleven months ago. Some allowance could be made for the Editor's offensiveness to the Bishop and his people on the former occasion, as his newly formed alliance with the more rabid section of the divided Orange party had brought upon him the journalistic malady, technically termed "furore," and he might not have been wholly responsible for what he had done under the excitement of frenzy. But now he writes in cold blood, and, to all appearance, with an animus of revenge for some real or imaginary wrong. On the former occasion he printed, corrected, revised and published, of his own free will and accord, for the sake of gratification of the malignant spirit of an unbelieving, anti-Christian Orangeman, certain awful and most atrocious blasphemies against the holy religion of five thousand of his fellow-citizens, who had never done harm to him, and against the two hundred and fifty million Christians who constitute the Church Catholic throughout the civilized world. He made his paper the vehicle for informing the public, in defiance of truth, justice, honor and decency, that they, all and each, are murderers by profession, bound by their vows of religious obedience to massacre their Protestant neighbors whenever opportunity offered; but happily, he was pleased to add, they cannot give effect to their sanguinary designs just now, the spirit of the age being unfavorable to such Popish pastimes. Had he the manliness to recall his abominable libel and write an apology? Not he. This would involve a rupture with his new-made friends and the political party in the County of Frontenac with whom they are for the time being identified. Be it known to all men, civilized and uncivilized, to the judges of the land and lawyers skilled in black letter, to honest citizens of every grade and class, and to the credit editor of the *Daily Whig*, that the credit editor of the *Daily Whig*, William Mayor of Kingston and chief magistrate, charged with the dispensation of equal justice between man and man, justifies his shameful outrage upon a peaceable religious body, numbering one-third or more of his fellow-citizens, by the plea, worthy of being commended to the South Sea Islands, that indeed the name of a "well-known" scribbler was appended to his publication! This he avers to be his sole and all sufficient justification before the civilized community of Canada. It means that, if any dirty creature "well known" in the streets, should deposit a beautiful copy of the *Whig* close door, the sanctimonious editor is forthwith authorized to appropriate that savory bucket, take it into his editorial workshop, smell it, analyse its contents, assure himself personally of its anti-Catholic venom, and then, to gratify the unchristian spite of the scavenger whose name is

labelled upon it, fling it in the face of his respectable Catholic neighbors, who, because they are a minority of the population, ought not to be cruelly exposed to public hatred by the imputation of murderous disposition towards those among whom they live. As well might the foreign emissaries of Socialism who killed the police in the streets of Chicago, plead before the criminal court that they had not manufactured the bombs in the underground cellar, but that those deadly dealing missiles had been given to them in a package bearing a "well-known" name; and consequently it was no harm at all to cast them into the ranks of civic officers engaged in the preservation of public peace. Search the records of legislation in every country under the sun, be its people white or black, Greek or barbarian, and nowhere shall an enactment be found in harmony with the sublime morality of the *Whig* editor's self-justification. When a man commits a homicide by deliberate discharge of a loaded revolver at his enemy's head, society demands his life in atonement, and is ordinarily unconcerned in the inquiry as to the name of the maker of the pistol or of the person that charged it. It would be interesting to see the sincerity of the editor's opinion on the subject of journalistic morality tested before our upright County Court Judge in a case of libel arising out of a grave personal slander written by a "well-known" somebody in a garret at midnight and published at 3 o'clock in the afternoon by the *Daily Whig*.

But why does this moral editor rake up again in October, 1888, the Bishop of Kingston's address delivered to the Home Rule meeting of November, 1885? The lovely Kane and Smith, the Orange Catalinae, had come and gone. The odour of their foul effusions at the "bedlam" meeting of Ireland's enemies in our city had gone with them, as they fled before the wrath of Robinson; they had been driven from Belleville by the just indignation of the populace and the press; and, finding no foothold anywhere, they had returned home to their Orange masters branded as impudent liars and vulgar impostors. But the *Whig* editor astutely thought, within himself that the "person called Smith," who attributed to the Lord Bishop of Kingston the use of the word "stupid" in reference to the Scotch people, because of their surrender of national autonomy, and had been convicted of a lie which he had not the courage to retract, had not lied wholly in vain. For, although His Lordship did not say, and did not think, that the Scotch had acted "stupidly," did he not say it of the Welsh, and is there not a good occasion thus supplied for exciting still some race-hatred against the Irish cause? The Bishop's representative character, and the applause given to his Home Rule argument, will make Irishmen in general responsible for every word, how casual soever, uttered by him in his two hours' extempore speech at that Home Rule meeting; and accordingly it has appeared to the *Whig* a fair and just thing to blow the coals of race-hatred, this being the order of the day in Canada. In this spirit a search is made through Mr. Gladstone's speeches for some expression contradictory of the Bishop of Kingston, and lo! it is found at last in a sentence whereby the Grand Old Man calls the Welsh for their splendid enthusiasm in support of Home Rule at the recent elections. He is urging the plain, common sense argument, so frequently put forward by the Most Rev. Bishop of Kingston in his published speeches and letters, that the system of self-government which has been productive of peace and prosperity among other peoples, ought to be extended to Ireland; and he thus refers to Wales: "Hon. W. E. Gladstone said recently: 'The Welsh are the most easily governed people in the world. Why? Because they govern themselves.' Like the Scotch they have practical autonomy. Ab, the Welsh are a splendid people. Their enthusiasm in our cause is magnificent." What must not be the measure of malignity that could turn an argument so congenial to the Bishop's mind, and so favorably intended by its author, into an engine of vindictive attack upon His Lordship and insult to the whole Irish race? Here the ingenious editor of the *Whig* concludes upon it: "And then, the people of whom a speaker, at a Kingston public meeting said, they had been too stupid to offer resistance to the British alliance. They have practical autonomy, and they govern themselves! Are these things lacking in Ireland, and why? If the Welsh can govern themselves why not the people of the emerald island?"

The intelligence that discerns contradiction here between Mr. Gladstone and the Bishop of Kingston must be far inferior to the average degree of mental capacity demanded of men in Canada. The Welsh are "easily governed, because they govern themselves." Is not this the Bishop's oft repeated argument in favor of self government for the Irish? "Like the Scotch, they have practical autonomy." Is not this precisely the difference between the case of Ireland and that of the Scotch and Welsh nation which formed the basis of His Lordship's Home Rule argument at last year's meeting? The two latter peoples enjoy a real, "practical" and complete representation in Westminster, giving effect to their legitimate wishes and shaping legislation into national form suited to their requirements respectively; whereas Ireland has never had, and never can be expected to have, an effective national representation in a Parliament composed almost entirely of her traditional enemies and oppressors, who hate her because they have plundered her and spilled the blood of millions of her heroic sons in the effort to extinguish her religion. "The Welsh are a splendid people. Their enthusiasm in our cause is magnificent." If the *Whig* would not be so careful in selecting the periods of the Bishop's absence from the city for personal attacks upon him, the question could be readily put to His Lordship through some proper medium, whether he disputes Mr. Gladstone's opinion on this point; and we are perfectly sure the answer would be a whole-souled approval of this panegyric on the Welsh for awakened enthusiasm in behalf of Ireland's rights. But how reconcile

the epithet "stupid" with "enthusiasm?" If the learned editor of the *Whig* insists on their being direct contradictions, we must only bow to his professional judgment. Our idea used to be, that two contradictions must be mutually exclusive and incapable of co-existence in the same subject. We also used to think that, even with reference to the same subject, they should be predicated of it under wholly similar respects. But now Mr. Gladstone speaks of Wales as it thinks and feels and acts to day; whereas the Bishop referred to the Wales of centuries ago. Mr. Gladstone contemplates the Welsh people as they now enjoy "practical self-government" by virtue of gradual extension of her political liberties, for many of which (for instance, democratic franchise) they are beholden to Mr. G. himself and the great Liberal Party in England guided by him; the Bishop alluded to quite other days, when Wales was almost as thoroughly enslaved by English despotism as Ireland has been, and when her people were brutally coerced into acceptance of that most galling and most degrading of all forms of national enslavement, an alien Church Establishment laid upon their shoulders and legally endorsed out of their revenues, with its ministers planted in every parish, to suck their life-blood and fatten upon their flesh, while piously defaming and denigrating their religious convictions. Will the chivalrous editor of the *Daily Whig* say that an Irishman, whose forefathers died on the field of battle, or pined to death in English dungeons, rather than submit to such tyranny; or a Scotchman, whose ancestors carefully provided in 1689, and again by Act of Union in 1707, that their accepted form of religious worship should be guaranteed to them, and on the first notice of a scheme for imposing an Anglican Establishment upon them, proceeded to furnish their weapons of war, may not fairly and indignantly express his estimate of Welsh acquiescence by the term "stupid," intending it, of course, in the political sense? For, we presume that the editor, who is a literary stylist, will discriminate the various meanings of the word according to its various applications. Applied personally and in the sense of obtuseness of intellect, it is, to say the least uncomplimentary. But when applied to public bodies, to governments, corporations, military strategists or political parties, in reference to a particular line of policy or taxation or campaigning or hustings cries, nothing is more common than the use of this word to signify an opponent's view of the unwisdom or unfitness of the proceedings of those bodies, without the least imputation of personal stupidity to individual members. In this sense of the term men speak also of journalistic stupidity; for instance, in the case of an editor pursuing a course of offensiveness against a class or race from whom he derives much of his income and by whose aid he has been lifted into social position. It is no slight to his personal intelligence to affirm editorial stupidity of him; and, if the people whom he habitually insults, have the power to wield the suffrage effectively at the approaching elections against any political party that suffer themselves to be represented by him as their organ, we must say plainly that he is indubitably stupid—editorially, of course. But what on earth possessed the mind of the *Whig* editor to dash out into that violent tirade of combined ignorance and insolence against the whole Irish nation, with which he concludes his editorial assault upon our Most Reverend and most highly revered Bishop? This is simply infatuation. Has he never read history? Or has he been asleep all through these years of public discussion upon the relations of Ireland with England, through which the world at large has come to learn the manifest justice and glorious chivalry of Ireland's claim, and the unquestioned disgrace brought by England upon herself and her barbarous oppression of Ireland? "Why does not Ireland enjoy self government?" asks the *Whig*. We leave our intelligent leaders undisturbed in their reflections upon this famous editorial *Whig*, *Whig*, *Whig*.—Kingston Freeman.

**EDITORIAL NOTES.**

We elsewhere publish a letter to the *Hamilton Spectator* from our esteemed friend "Clanachill." We are reluctantly compelled by demands on our space to hold our observations on the question till next issue.

A FULL description of the new Chatham church, the laying of whose cornerstone took place on Sunday last, will appear in a future issue, together with an elegantly executed wood cut of the proposed building.

WE LEARN from the *Buffalo Union and Times* that "among other bequests in the late Father Faure's will are the following: Sisters Hospital, \$100; St. Vincent's Female Orphan Asylum, \$100; German Orphan Asylum, \$100; Grey Nuns, \$100; St. Mary's Academy, \$100; Jesuit Fathers, \$200; Oblate Fathers, \$200.

WE HAVE received a copy of Mr. B. Lynch's able and incisive pamphlet in reply to the Kane-Smith fallacies uttered in Toronto. Mr. Lynch, who is a gifted son of Ireland, has already done the cause of that suffering land very marked service. This service, marked and genuine as it is, augurs well for our young friend's future. Every Irishman in Canada should have a copy of the pamphlet.

No one knows what he can do till he is fully resolved to what he can do.

Father Wood, an English monk at Rome, constructed the first pianoforte in 1711.

He who lives in vain, lives worse than in vain. He who lives to no purpose, lives to a bad purpose.—*Nevins*.