

The article concludes with the acknowledgment that at all times there have been women, who, by their solid merit, have distinguished themselves above their sex, as their have been, innumerable instances of men who, by their defects, have dishonoured theirs. But these are but particular and exceptional cases and form no rule. It has, at the same time, to be admitted that very many spheres of usefulness, hitherto exclusively occupied by men, should be equally open to women.

The woman suffrage movement, which at one time promised to assume such formidable proportions in the neighboring republic, has now there dwindled into insignificance. So, too, in England, where every extension of the franchise has weakened its force, till now no public man of prominence can be found to espouse the cause of the British Louise Michels. In Canada there never was any widespread or general agitation in favor of woman suffrage. Mr. Waters was, therefore, unable to force his bill to a vote this session. His measure, we must, however, admit, is the logical outcome of the co-education of the sexes practiced in the public schools of the province. The principles underlying our system of public school education would, if carried to their rational consequences, lead us to communism itself. This the good sense of our people fortunately prevents.

THE WELSHMEN SOLD.

The Tories have, since their summary and ignominious ejection from power in January last, lost no occasion and spared no effort to arouse anti-Irish and anti-Catholic prejudice to block Mr. Gladstone's scheme of Home Rule. In many of the bye elections that have since taken place direct appeals to vulgar passions have been made. Lord Randolph Churchill's visit to Belfast was conceived with no other purpose. Mr. Davitt some time ago stated that all attempt to raise religious cries in Wales had failed so completely that further efforts have been abandoned, and an illustration of this ill success could be found in the fact that in certain Welsh constituencies, where that kind of tactics had been extensively employed, the electors have expressed a disposition to offer Mr. Parnell a nomination for parliament at the next elections, should he wish to stand as a candidate for a Welsh seat. The misery existing in Kerry has made a very much deeper impression in Wales than any one who has not recently visited that country could imagine, and the causes leading to that lamentable state of affairs, as well as those which prevent the immediate application of remedies, are well known and carefully considered in Wales. Mr. Davitt's view is fully borne out by the result of the Flintshire election on the 3rd inst., the figures being Smith, Liberal, 4,248; Penant, Conservative, 2,733.

A TISSUE OF FALSEHOODS.

A friend sends us the following for remarks. It is taken from a book entitled "Louis Riel, the Rebel Chief."

"The good priests of Red River, and their pious vicar, *per* Lestane, whom Monseigneur had left in charge of the Diocese, while he was attending the Ecumenical Council in Rome, came forward with their homage. These worthy gentlemen had been in the habit of reading from the Catechism ever since the time they were first able to tell their beads, or to make mud pies, these words: 'He that resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God; and they that (so) resist shall purchase to themselves damnation.' Here was a madly ambitious adventurer 'resisting the power,' and, therefore, 'resisting the ordinances of God;' but these precious divines saw no harm whatever in the act. Indeed, they were the most persistent abettors in the uprising, counselling their flock to be zealous and firm, and to follow the advice of their patriotic and able leader, *per* Riel. The great swaggering, windy *per* Riel, took his coarse person from house to house denouncing the Canadian Government and inciting the people.

"No harm can come to you," he would say; "you have in the Canadian Government a good friend in Mr. George E. Cartier. He will see that no hair of one of your heads is touched." And Riel went abroad giving the same assurance. Moreover, it was known to every thinking one of the fifteen thousand Metis that Riel was a *protege* of Monseigneur Tache; that through this pious bishop it was he had received his education, and that His Lordship would not alone seek to minimize what his favorite had done, but would say that the uprising was a justifiable one. This was how the Catholic Church in Red River stimulated the diseased vanity and the lawless spirit of this thrice dangerous Guitau of the plains."

The book from which this extract is taken is, we are told, for sale on all trains in Western Ontario. Those who have charge of railway literature seem to think their stock in trade must excel either in falsehood or in obscenity. The book above alluded to excels in the first regard. We need not tell our readers that the statements above cited concerning the Catholic clergy in the North-West are one tissue of villainous misrepresentations. But for Archbishop Tache and the priests the North-West would not to-day be part of Canada. This we have more than once shown in the Record.

THE LATE FATHER TABARET.

The Fathers of the faculty of the College of Ottawa have, since the death of their esteemed and lamented President, the venerable and venerated Father Tabaret, received many expressions of condolence from leading men in church and state. Among the many expressions of regret that have served to console them in their affliction were those received from the Archbishops of Toronto and Quebec, the Bishop of London and the Vicar Apostolic of Pontiac. We are in this issue enabled to lay before our readers copies of resolutions adopted by the City Council and the St. Patrick's Literary Association of Ottawa.

At a meeting of the council of the corporation of the city of Ottawa, held on Monday, March 1st, 1886, it was Moved by Ald. Heney, seconded by Ald. Durocher,

"That this council has heard with regret of the sudden death of the Rev. Dr. Tabaret, for many years superior of the College of Ottawa, and take this opportunity to testify to the great services rendered by him in the cause of education and to his many other virtues. Carried unanimously.

The resolution of the St. Patrick's Literary Association reads as follows:

Resolved "That the association having learned with profound regret of the death of Dr. Tabaret, president of an institution from which it has received so many acts of kindness, desires to tender the faculty of the college its heartfelt condolence and sympathy." Carried unanimously.

But besides these testimonies of regret from important representative bodies, we have before us a copy of the letter to His Lordship the Bishop of Ottawa from His Excellency the Governor General. This letter speaks volumes for His Excellency's goodness of heart and will long redound to his credit:

March 1st, 1886.  
MY DEAR LORD BISHOP,—I have just read in the morning paper the sad news of Father Tabaret's death, and I cannot refrain from expressing to you my sense of the great loss which the community has sustained, and my sympathy with those who are mourning him.

It is a real calamity to the college, the success of which was so closely identified with his enlightened guidance; and the blow has fallen with a suddenness which must render it for the moment quite overwhelming.

If you have any opportunity of making known to the authorities of the college my deep regret for their misfortune and my regret for the chief whom they have lost, I know you will be kind enough to avail yourself of it.

I have the honor to be, my dear Lord Bishop, yours faithfully, LANDSDOWNE.

THAT FORGERY AGAIN.

His Grace the Archbishop of Toronto's prompt effacement of the gross falsehood charging Cardinal Manning with the authorship of an infamous letter to Lord Robert Montague, has forced the perversers of truth to take another line, as the following letter in the Mail of Thursday, March 11th, will clearly show:

THE ALLEGED FORGERY.

SIR,—A friend of mine sent a copy of the correspondence said to have passed between Lord Robert Montague and Cardinal Manning, and Lord Robert Montague testifies to its genuineness. A reply is now before me which reads as follows:—  
41 Queen's Gate, London, S. W.,  
Feb. 24, 1886.

SIR,—I have received your letter and the two enclosures.

My letter of February 19th, 1883, is, as far as I can see, correct. It was addressed to a "Monsignor" of the Roman Catholic Church. His reply dated 20th February, 1883, seems also to be correct. As that Monsignor is alive, and as the knowledge of his name would subject him to bitter and life-long persecution, I refrain from giving his name. The editor who published the letter made a not unnatural mistake in ascribing the Monsignor's letter to Cardinal Manning, because a letter of mine addressed to Cardinal Manning was published just before it in the English papers. With regard to the Monsignor's letter, it is authentic and extant, and the Monsignor deservedly holds a very high position, which is mainly due to his excellent qualities and character.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your obedient servant,  
ROBERT MONTAGUE.

The letter in question is not a forgery, it was written by a distinguished Roman Catholic dignitary, not, it is true, by Cardinal Manning, but by one of exalted rank in the Roman Church. My friend has left Lord Robert's letter with me, and I will show it to any doubters.

JOHN HAGER.

The fall from a cardinal to a monsignor will likely be followed by another step down to the cardinal's sexton, or the monsignor's boot-black. This rapid descent reminds us of one of the late Abraham Lincoln's imitable stories. Lincoln, told of a bucolic republican who, having done service during the campaign of 1860, came to Washington some time after the inauguration of the new President to look for office. His first question put to the shrewd Chief Executive of the nation was: "Are there any foreign embassies vacant." The President assured his good friend that these had for some time been all filled. "Well, then," said the droll western politician, who was bound to get some mark of presidential favor, "Are there any village postmaster-ships vacant." That letter to Lord Robert Montague will yet, we fear, be looking for very humble patronage.

A CANADIAN CARDINAL.

In its last issue the Baltimore Mirror publishes the following telegram from Rome, under date March 9th.

The Holy Father has selected the Most Rev. James Gibbons Archbishop of Baltimore, the Most Rev. Elzear Alexandre Taschereau, Archbishop of Quebec, Canada, for elevation to the dignity of the cardinalate.

The news of Archbishop Taschereau's proposed elevation has been received in this country with every manifestation of pleasure and satisfaction. His Grace's career has been one of singular merit and success. Born on the 17th of February, 1820, at Ste. Marie de la Beauce, Mgr. Alex. Taschereau has just entered his sixty-seventh year, but is yet healthy and energetic. He belongs to one of Lower Canada's most illustrious families, a family that has given the country many of its most gifted magistrates and legislators. His father was the Hon. Thomas Taschereau, a leading member of the old parliament of Lower Canada and one of the subscribers with Papineau to the famous ninety-two resolutions. Mgr. Taschereau is the brother of Hon. Jean Thomas Taschereau, ex-judge of the Supreme Court of Canada, and uncle of Hon. Elzear Taschereau, actually on the Bench of the same court, and of Hon. Henri T. Taschereau and M. Liniere Taschereau, the former a judge of the Superior Court of Quebec, the latter a member of the Canadian Commons. On his mother's side this venerable prelate belongs to another distinguished family, the Panets. Having made his studies in Quebec, he proceeded to Rome, where he received the ecclesiastical tonsure at the hands of Mgr. Platte, Archbishop of Trebizond. He was ordained priest at Quebec on the 10th of September, 1842, and five years later devoted himself generously to the service of the hospitals of Grosse Ile, where hundreds of poor Irish emigrants were suffering from an aggravated form of typhus, thousands dying. His generous spirit of self-sacrifice brought him to death's door, for he himself contracted the awful malarial fever.

In 1849 he became professor in the seminary of Quebec, director and Superior of the Grand Seminary in 1859, assistant rector of Laval University the following year. In 1852 he became rector of the same institution and vicar-general of the archdiocese of Quebec, under Mgr. Baillargeon. In 1854 he went to Rome, where he received the degree of doctor of canon law. On the same occasion he brought to the Holy Father for approbation the decrees of the second Provincial council of Quebec. In 1871 he was charged by the Pope to bring from Rome to Canada the bulls authorizing his own consecration as bishop in *partibus* and coadjutor with the right of succession to Mgr. Baillargeon. But the latter dying soon after his return, Mgr. Taschereau became Archbishop of Quebec, His Grace Archbishop Lynch presiding at his consecration. During his Grace's episcopal career many events of the highest importance to the church have transpired. Mgr. Conroy, as Delegate, and Mgr. Smeulders as Commissary Apostolic, both visited the country on missions of urgent significance. In 1874 he presided at the bicentenary celebration of the foundation of the See of Quebec.

The Archbishop of Quebec is, in truth, a prelate of rare personal merit. Under an apparent severity he conceals an extreme tenderness of disposition and rare kindness of character. He is gifted with a most winning affability combined with an extreme dignity of manners. As a theologian he is an authority of the first order, as a pastor a veritable apostle. We tender His Grace our most heartfelt congratulations in his elevation to a dignity which, high as it is, he will adorn with those virtues that have so long in his person shed lustre on the See of Quebec and the Church of Canada.

ECCLESIASTICAL CHANGES IN QUEBEC.

A Montreal despatch, dated the 14th inst., says that the elevation of His Grace the Archbishop of Quebec to the Cardinalate is likely to bring on important changes in that ecclesiastical Province. A coadjutor will, it is said, be given His Eminence, a position for which the names of Bishop Racine of Chicoutimi, and Bishop Gravel of Nicolet are mentioned. The despatch adds that Montreal, being the commercial and Ottawa the political metropolis of the Dominion, it is likely that Bishops Fabre and Duhamel will shortly be made Archbishops, and that the diocese of Montreal will be divided into three parts, with new sees at St. John and Joliette. No credence should of course be given to mere newspaper rumors in matters ecclesiastical. But there is, we think, a certain basis for at least the latter portion of this despatch. And we may say that we heartily trust it will prove true. Not only are the cities of Montreal and Ottawa entitled to the distinction mentioned, but their illustrious prelates eminently worthy of the metropolitan dignity. Our readers need not, in our estimation, be surprised if within a few months the statements of the despatch in this respect be found substantially correct.

MARRIAGE—DIVORCE—MORMONISM.

That well informed journal, the Catholic Columbian, is authority for the statement that "six hundred and fourteen divorces were granted in Massachusetts last year. Yet the Bay State is supposed to be the centre of goodness and Christianity in this country—nevertheless, Christ said that what God had joined together no man could put asunder."

Six hundred and fourteen divorces in one year! The statement is appalling, for it means that, within the brief space of twelve months, that number of families has been broken up, and that society has, through legal machinery, received that very number of rude and convulsive shocks. The marriage relation is, by millions of non-Catholics, and by not a few professing Catholics, now looked on as a mere legal figment—a conventional tie that, by the will of either contracting party, may, with or without a moment's notice, be snapped in sunder. Men of even the slightest serious turn of mind, among our republican neighbors, stand in alarm at the rapid decay of public morality, the defilement of human passion in the revival of heathen promiscuity. "In New England, which," said Talmage in a recent discourse, mis-called a sermon, "has been considered by many the most moral part of the United States, there are two thousand divorces per year. And in Massachusetts, the headquarters of a ready habit, there is one divorce case to every fourteen marriages. The State of Maine, considered by many almost frigid in proprieties, has in one year 478 divorces. In Vermont swapping wives is not a rare transaction. In Connecticut there are women who boast that they have four or five times been divorced. Moreover, our boasted Protestantism, on this subject, more lax than Roman Catholicism. Roman Catholicism admits of no divorce except for the reason that Christ admitted as a lawful reason. But Protestantism is admitting anything and every thing, and the larger the proportion of Protestants in any part of the country, the larger the ratio of divorce. Do you not then think that Protestantism needs some toning up on this subject."

New England has never, by any one knowing aught of its social history for the last fifty years, been considered the most moral portion of the United States. From that sage and pharisaic section of the country have come the theories of self-sufficiency, self-righteousness and godless disrespect for authority, that, carried into practice all over the land, justify preacher Talmage's outspoken condemnation of his non-Catholic fellow countrymen's disregard of the sanctity of marriage.

"Aye," said he, in the same speech above cited from, "when you realize that the sacred and divine institution is being caricatured and defamed by clandestine marriages and escapes all over the land, does there not seem a call for such discussion? Hardly a morning or evening paper comes into your possession without reporting them, and there are 50 of these occurrences where one is reported, because it is the interest of all parties to hush them up. The victims are, all hours of the night, climbing down ladders or crossing over from State to State, that they may reach laws of greater laxity, holding reception six months after marriage to let the public know for the first time that a half year before they were united in wedlock. Ministers of religion, and justices of the peace, and mayors of cities, willingly joining in marriage runaways from other States and neighbors; the coach box and the back of the princely landau in flirtation; telegrams flashing across the country for the arrest of absconded school misses, who started off with arms full of books, and taking rail trains to meet their affianced—in the snow drifts of the great storm that has recently passed over the country some of them, I read, have perished—thousands of people in a marriage whose bans have never been published; precipitated conjugality; bigamy triumphant; marriage a joke; society blotched all over with putrefaction on this subject, which no one but the Almighty God can arrest."

But neither the philippics of Dr. Talmage, nor the occasional protests of the papers against the degradation of matrimony, will avail of good to the country or its people till a due knowledge of the nature and respect for the character and obligations of matrimony be instilled into the minds of the people. Catholics should ever, in the presence of the constantly rising tide of immorality, have before their eyes the teachings of Holy Church on this most vital and sacred of subjects. In that most excellent of popular compendiums of Catholic doctrine and practice, "Catholic Belief," it is laid down that matrimony or marriage is the conjugal union of a man and a woman naturally and legally fit to marry. Raised by Christ to the dignity of a sacrament, its bond or tie can only be sundered by the death of either of the contracting parties. Both parties to the marriage contract incur many responsibilities, have many difficulties to meet, many burdens to bear and many temptations to overcome. In raising marriage to the dignity of a sacrament Jesus Christ imposed stricter and nobler duties on the married couple than those laid on them in the old dispensation. He binds them to be subject one to the other and the women subject to their husbands as to the Lord. (Eph. v. 22). Loving, cherishing, supporting each other, they are to bring up their children in the fear and love of God. "Provoke not your children to anger, but bring them up in the discipline and correction of the Lord." By matrimony there is conveyed to the worthy recipients a very great and special sacramental grace. Jesus Himself ennobled and sanctified the marriage state by personally assisting at the nuptials of Cana in Galilee. He sanctioned the marital bond by these sacred words: "What, therefore, God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." (Mark x. 9), and besides gave it rank among the sacraments of the new law.

St. Paul calls matrimony not only a sacrament but a "great sacrament," for it is a sacrament in a two-fold degree, 1st, in the ordinary sense of its being an outward sign of holy and indissoluble union strengthened by the transmission of great and special graces, and, 2dly, because marriage itself, when legitimately contracted, is a mystic sign and symbol of Christ's union with His Church. "This is," said the apostle of the Gentiles, "a great sacrament, but I speak in Christ and in the Church." (Eph. v. 32.) St. Cyril declares that Christ sanctified wedlock, and gave grace to marriage. Tertullian, St. Irenaeus, St. Augustine and St. Ambrose all termed marriage a sacrament; and the Nestorian, Coptic, Armenian and Greek schismatics agree with the Holy Catholic Apostolic and Roman Church in recognizing marriage as a sacrament.

Now, as the union of Christ with His Church is indissoluble, so also is the tie binding husband and wife. No cause can justify nor earthly power authorize the breaking of a true and legitimate marriage between Christians once it has been consummated. Separation by mutual consent is sometimes, but for grave reasons only, permitted. This separation, allowed in favor of the innocent party, is not divorce in the modern sense of the term, for the marriage bond is not thereby broken, and neither party can again marry in the life-time of the other. Whenever the word divorce is applied to such separations, it means simply separation from bed and board. Divorce, in the sense that a person separated from his or her partner in wedlock, may re-marry during the life-time of that partner, is forbidden by the Law of God, and, as already stated, no reason can justify or earthly authority sanction such a proceeding. This has been the teaching of the Church Catholic from the beginning. The Fathers are unanimous to this point, and Jesus Christ Himself too explicit to be misunderstood on the subject of matrimonial indissolubility. "Every one," said He, "that putteth away his wife, and marieth another, committeth adultery; and he that marieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery." (Lake xvi., 8.) And St. Paul, with the terseness so peculiar to himself, declares: "To them that are married, not I, but the Lord commandeth, that the wife depart not from her husband. And if she depart, that she remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband. And let not the husband put away his wife." (1 Cor. vii., 10 11.)

A word now as to Mormonism before we conclude. President Cleveland, in his last annual message to Congress, thus stigmatizes this blot on American civilization:

"The strength, the perpetuity, and the destiny of the nation rest upon our homes established by the law of God guarded by parental care, regulated by parental authority, and sanctified by parental love. These are not the homes of polygamy. The mothers of our land who rule the nation as they model the characters and guide the actions of their sons, live according to God's holy ordinances, and each secure and happy in the exclusive love of the father of her child, shed the warm light of true womanhood, unperturbed and unpoluted, upon all within her pure and wholesome family circle. These are not the cheerless, crushed, and unwomanly mothers of polygamy. The fathers of our families are the best citizens of the Republic. Wife and children are the sources of patriotism, and conjugal and parental affection beget devotion to the country. The man who, undivided with plural marriage, is surrounded in his single home with his wife and children, has a stake in the country which inspires him with respect for its laws and courage for its defence. These are not the fathers of polygamous families. There is no feature of this practice or the system which sanctions it, which is not opposed to all that is of value in our institutions."

"There should be no relaxation in the firm but just execution of the law now in operation, and I should be glad to approve such further discreet legislation as will rid the country of this blot upon its fair fame. Since the people uphold polygamy in our territory are reinforced by immigration from other lands, I recommend that a law be passed to prevent the importation of Mormons into the country."

These are noble words, and well spoken; but what has been their effect? Have they stirred up the heart of the nation to a really serious effort to obliterate Mormonism? No, emphatically no. Why? See Dr. Talmage as already quoted, see the divorce statistics in New England and elsewhere—see the godlessness, immorality and blasphemy

binds them to be subject one to the other and the women subject to their husbands as to the Lord. (Eph. v. 22). Loving, cherishing, supporting each other, they are to bring up their children in the fear and love of God. "Provoke not your children to anger, but bring them up in the discipline and correction of the Lord." By matrimony there is conveyed to the worthy recipients a very great and special sacramental grace. Jesus Himself ennobled and sanctified the marriage state by personally assisting at the nuptials of Cana in Galilee. He sanctioned the marital bond by these sacred words: "What, therefore, God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." (Mark x. 9), and besides gave it rank among the sacraments of the new law.

St. Paul calls matrimony not only a sacrament but a "great sacrament," for it is a sacrament in a two-fold degree, 1st, in the ordinary sense of its being an outward sign of holy and indissoluble union strengthened by the transmission of great and special graces, and, 2dly, because marriage itself, when legitimately contracted, is a mystic sign and symbol of Christ's union with His Church. "This is," said the apostle of the Gentiles, "a great sacrament, but I speak in Christ and in the Church." (Eph. v. 32.) St. Cyril declares that Christ sanctified wedlock, and gave grace to marriage. Tertullian, St. Irenaeus, St. Augustine and St. Ambrose all termed marriage a sacrament; and the Nestorian, Coptic, Armenian and Greek schismatics agree with the Holy Catholic Apostolic and Roman Church in recognizing marriage as a sacrament.

Now, as the union of Christ with His Church is indissoluble, so also is the tie binding husband and wife. No cause can justify nor earthly power authorize the breaking of a true and legitimate marriage between Christians once it has been consummated. Separation by mutual consent is sometimes, but for grave reasons only, permitted. This separation, allowed in favor of the innocent party, is not divorce in the modern sense of the term, for the marriage bond is not thereby broken, and neither party can again marry in the life-time of the other. Whenever the word divorce is applied to such separations, it means simply separation from bed and board. Divorce, in the sense that a person separated from his or her partner in wedlock, may re-marry during the life-time of that partner, is forbidden by the Law of God, and, as already stated, no reason can justify or earthly authority sanction such a proceeding. This has been the teaching of the Church Catholic from the beginning. The Fathers are unanimous to this point, and Jesus Christ Himself too explicit to be misunderstood on the subject of matrimonial indissolubility. "Every one," said He, "that putteth away his wife, and marieth another, committeth adultery; and he that marieth her that is put away from her husband committeth adultery." (Lake xvi., 8.) And St. Paul, with the terseness so peculiar to himself, declares: "To them that are married, not I, but the Lord commandeth, that the wife depart not from her husband. And if she depart, that she remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband. And let not the husband put away his wife." (1 Cor. vii., 10 11.)

A word now as to Mormonism before we conclude. President Cleveland, in his last annual message to Congress, thus stigmatizes this blot on American civilization:

"The strength, the perpetuity, and the destiny of the nation rest upon our homes established by the law of God guarded by parental care, regulated by parental authority, and sanctified by parental love. These are not the homes of polygamy. The mothers of our land who rule the nation as they model the characters and guide the actions of their sons, live according to God's holy ordinances, and each secure and happy in the exclusive love of the father of her child, shed the warm light of true womanhood, unperturbed and unpoluted, upon all within her pure and wholesome family circle. These are not the cheerless, crushed, and unwomanly mothers of polygamy. The fathers of our families are the best citizens of the Republic. Wife and children are the sources of patriotism, and conjugal and parental affection beget devotion to the country. The man who, undivided with plural marriage, is surrounded in his single home with his wife and children, has a stake in the country which inspires him with respect for its laws and courage for its defence. These are not the fathers of polygamous families. There is no feature of this practice or the system which sanctions it, which is not opposed to all that is of value in our institutions."

"There should be no relaxation in the firm but just execution of the law now in operation, and I should be glad to approve such further discreet legislation as will rid the country of this blot upon its fair fame. Since the people uphold polygamy in our territory are reinforced by immigration from other lands, I recommend that a law be passed to prevent the importation of Mormons into the country."

These are noble words, and well spoken; but what has been their effect? Have they stirred up the heart of the nation to a really serious effort to obliterate Mormonism? No, emphatically no. Why? See Dr. Talmage as already quoted, see the divorce statistics in New England and elsewhere—see the godlessness, immorality and blasphemy

ous disregard of all things holy revealed by the every day record of crime in the daily press—see the rejection of God and the worship of Mammon in his stead—see all this and you will understand the impotence of the great American nation as against a handful of polygamists.

ARCH CONFRATERNITY OF THE SACKED HEART OF JESUS.

On Sunday last after High Mass His Lordship, the Bishop of London, occupied the pulpit of St. Peter's Cathedral, preaching a most effective sermon from the gospel of the day. He spoke at length on spiritual sloth and indifference, which he stigmatized as fruitful of the gravest evils. He showed that, as in worldly affairs it was the vigilant, the energetic and the industrious that achieved success, so in the spiritual order it was they only who did as their Divine Redeemer had commanded them, who, in a word, watched and prayed, that overcame sin or advanced to perfection. Sloth was one of the seven deadly sins, and had in a most special manner to be combated by all Christians. The true Christian life was one of self-sacrifice and therefore antagonistic to sloth or indifference. They should be alive, active, watchful. Their enemy was ever on the alert going about even as a roaring lion, seeking whom he might devour, or by the dark ways of subtlety and cunning insinuating himself into their favor. His Lordship then with much earnestness dwelt on the duty of prayer. Without God they could do nothing in the way of salvation, and God they could not have with them without prayer. It was not enough for the Catholics of this city that they had a magnificent cathedral, a beautiful temple to worship in. They should seek to sanctify the temples of their own souls and bodies consecrated to God by the regenerating and vivifying sacraments of His Church. These were more precious in the sight of heaven than even the most splendid efforts of genius in stone or marble. Now these temples of their own souls they could only sanctify by keeping them free from sin, and sin they could exclude by one way only—the way pointed out by Christ Himself, by watching and praying. To better enable them to pray with fruit and with profit—to pray in union—he had, he said, in virtue of authority received from the Holy See, decided upon establishing in the parish of London the Archconfraternity of the Sacked Heart of Jesus. His Lordship invited all the communicants of the parish to enroll themselves in that pious association at four o'clock that very afternoon, when there would be present some of the cathedral priests to take down the names and give the certificates of membership. He explained that the duties of membership were very light comparatively. There was imposed upon each one joining the archconfraternity the duty of reciting every day one *Our Father*, one *Hail Mary*, one *I Believe in God*, and also the following brief and beautiful ejaculation:

Sweet Heart of my Jesus, make me ever love Thee more and more!

The privileges of the archconfraternity were the following:

INDULGENCES.

Plenary—1. On the day of admission, 2.—On the Feast of the Sacred Heart, 3.—On the first Friday or first Sunday of the month.

4.—On one day of each month at choice.

5.—At the hour of death.

6.—Five days of the Stations of Rome; also Christmas, Maundy Thursday, Easter, Ascension, Pentecost, Immaculate Conception, Nativity B. V. M., Annunciation, Purification, Assumption, St. Joseph, SS. Peter and Paul, All Saints, All Souls, St. John, St. Gregory the Great, St. Pius V.; the 6 Fridays (or Sundays) before the Feast of the Sacred Heart.

Partial—1. Seven years and seven quarantines for going to the Sacraments on the four Sundays before the Feast of the Sacred Heart, and each day of the public novena. These are not 2. Sixty days for every work of piety devoutly performed during the day.

Noted by a church is necessary, except for No. 6, but the prayers for the Pope must be said.

His Lordship added that the spiritual direction of the Archconfraternity had been given to the Rev. Father Walsh, that as many as all possibly desirous were expected to attend Mass on the first Friday of each month, and that a monthly meeting of the Archconfraternity would be held monthly in the Cathedral on the same day that 7 p. m., to be followed by benediction of the Most Holy Sacrament.

We are happy to state that in response to the invitation of the Bishop the people of St. Peter's congregation attended in large numbers at four o'clock Sunday evening, to have themselves enrolled as members of the Archconfraternity. Three of the priests were long kept busy in entering the names and distributing certificates. Already six hundred persons have been enrolled, and hundreds more will, no doubt, follow their example. By the spread of this pious association, London will become, by its prayerful spirit, a truly pious and exemplary parish.

Bishop K-euse of Richmond, Va., presides over a diocese 40,000 square miles in extent. There are only 18,000 Catholics in this vast space. He has but thirty-two priests. He complains of the scarcity.