

THE CATHOLIC RECORD PUBLISHED WEEKLY AT 486 RICHMOND ST. LONDON, ONTARIO.

Catholic Record.

LONDON, SATURDAY, APR. 3, 1886.

CALENDAR FOR APRIL.

CONSECRATED TO THE PASSION OF OUR LORD AND HIS BLESSED LORD.

1 Off. of St. Sac. St. Hugh, Bp. and Conf.

2 St. Vincent Ferrer, Conf.

3 St. Celestine I., P. and Conf.

4 St. Andrew, St. G. and D. (April 4)

5 Off. of St. Sac. St. Dionysius, Bp. and Conf.

6 St. Pious, Conf.

7 St. Macarius, Bp. and Conf.

8 St. Vincent, Conf.

9 St. Basil, Conf.

10 St. Basil, Conf.

11 St. Basil, Conf.

12 St. Basil, Conf.

13 St. Basil, Conf.

14 St. Basil, Conf.

15 St. Basil, Conf.

16 St. Basil, Conf.

17 St. Basil, Conf.

18 St. Basil, Conf.

19 St. Basil, Conf.

20 St. Basil, Conf.

21 St. Basil, Conf.

22 St. Basil, Conf.

23 St. Basil, Conf.

24 St. Basil, Conf.

25 St. Basil, Conf.

26 St. Basil, Conf.

27 St. Basil, Conf.

28 St. Basil, Conf.

29 St. Basil, Conf.

30 St. Basil, Conf.

31 St. Basil, Conf.

32 St. Basil, Conf.

33 St. Basil, Conf.

34 St. Basil, Conf.

35 St. Basil, Conf.

36 St. Basil, Conf.

37 St. Basil, Conf.

38 St. Basil, Conf.

39 St. Basil, Conf.

40 St. Basil, Conf.

41 St. Basil, Conf.

42 St. Basil, Conf.

43 St. Basil, Conf.

44 St. Basil, Conf.

45 St. Basil, Conf.

46 St. Basil, Conf.

47 St. Basil, Conf.

48 St. Basil, Conf.

49 St. Basil, Conf.

50 St. Basil, Conf.

51 St. Basil, Conf.

52 St. Basil, Conf.

53 St. Basil, Conf.

54 St. Basil, Conf.

55 St. Basil, Conf.

56 St. Basil, Conf.

57 St. Basil, Conf.

58 St. Basil, Conf.

59 St. Basil, Conf.

60 St. Basil, Conf.

61 St. Basil, Conf.

62 St. Basil, Conf.

63 St. Basil, Conf.

64 St. Basil, Conf.

65 St. Basil, Conf.

66 St. Basil, Conf.

67 St. Basil, Conf.

68 St. Basil, Conf.

69 St. Basil, Conf.

70 St. Basil, Conf.

71 St. Basil, Conf.

72 St. Basil, Conf.

73 St. Basil, Conf.

74 St. Basil, Conf.

75 St. Basil, Conf.

76 St. Basil, Conf.

77 St. Basil, Conf.

78 St. Basil, Conf.

79 St. Basil, Conf.

80 St. Basil, Conf.

ing the enclosed draft for twenty-one pounds sterling in aid of the Irish Parliamentary Fund. My mission is small and poor, consisting of less than one hundred families in all, and we are still in debt for our church, or else offering in aid of the good cause would have been larger. It gives me very great pleasure to add that the appointment of your Grace to the see of St. Laurence has given inexpressible joy to all the Irish clergy in Canada. Although only a child when I left Limerick, I have never forgotten my native land, and I rejoice now to be able to add my humble mite to aid her in her efforts to obtain legislative independence such as we enjoy in Canada. Hoping your Grace will kindly favour me with an acknowledgment of the enclosed, wishing you multos annos, and asking a share in your holy prayers, your Grace's most dutiful and obedient son in Christ, T. J. DOWLING, Vice-General, Paris, France.

Halifax, Nova Scotia, Feb. 20th, 1886. MY LORD ARCHBISHOP—I am instructed by Dr. Farrell, president of the Charitable Irish Society of Halifax, to forward to your Grace a draft on London for £135 2s 1d sterling, being a contribution to the Irish Parliamentary Fund from a few Irishmen and their descendants residing in Halifax, who, having a love for the Emerald Isle, and enjoying the blessings of a good system of government in the land of their adoption, desire to assist, through a small financial way, the present efforts to obtain for Ireland a measure of Home Rule such as we happily enjoy in Canada. I have the honor to be, my Lord Archbishop, your Grace's most obedient servant, JAMES J. O'BRIEN, Secretary of the C. Irish Society, Halifax, N. S., D. C.

The sentiments of all Canadians who love Canada and are devoted to its real interests, and not intent upon provoking a war of races and of creeds, are clearly, fully and exactly reflected in the letters just cited. Of enemies of Ireland there are some in this country, as there are in every country under the sun foes of right and justice and equality. With regret we say it that these are most numerous in a city accustomed to pride itself on enlightenment and progress, the metropolis of Ontario, the Queen city of the West, Toronto. The anti Irish bigots there are led by men notoriously haters of their Irish Catholic fellow-countrymen, men whose sole aim, intent, purpose and action is to divide this happy land, and its contented, loyal, and progressive population, into two hostile camps clamoring for blood, and bent on destruction. The leaders of this would-be fratricidal and suicidal movement are Prof. Goldwin Smith, and the "Rev." Drs. Will and Potts. We have before us a letter addressed to the Globe by that talented and promising young Irish Canadian barrister, Mr. J. A. Mulligan, that in our estimation deserves place side by side with the cheering letters above quoted. It is an evidence of the spirit that is abroad in this bright and free land, in favor of justice to Ireland. Mr. Mulligan, writing to the Globe of March 23rd, said:

Sir,—Before addressing myself to the task of exposing the other inaccuracies contained in the explanation which the Rev. Dr. Potts made from his pulpit, I will endeavor to show, that in stating that he never referred to the Land League in his now famous address, he has risked a statement which the published reports of his speech will not sustain. How does this denial accord with certain passages in his address? Having reference to a Land League meeting in Philadelphia, for none other has been held there lately in the interest of the Irish cause; he stated on the authority of Prof. Smith that "they put a murderer in the chair of their meeting." If he will deny that this was a Land League meeting, in all candour and honesty I will acknowledge the truth of his statement and congratulate our League that even Dr. Potts cannot venture to cast reflections upon it. If he cannot make the denial it is as "plain as a pikestaff" that he did refer to the Land League of Toronto when he said that the same element that elected a murderer as chairman in Philadelphia, was the dissenting element at their meeting. The previous sentence, I believe, established my contention. "They" (referring to the "same element" in Toronto as the Land Leaguers in Philadelphia), "are bringing a murderer and ex-convict to Toronto to lecture on St. Patrick's Day." There is a "tid-bit" for my clerical opponent. Having maligned our League, as his explanation shows, he has not, with all his vaunted courage, been manly enough to make proper reparation. He has purposely aggravated the insult, though he could not increase the injury. To be compelled at any time to make an apology is humiliating to man's pride. When such is needed, to do so with grace and completeness is evidence of gentlemanlike education and Christian training. I scarcely expected the absence of this quality in an Irish divine.

How does this other unreliability of both his address and explanation, I will dissect them with a calmness that probably excite Dr. Potts. He has already been forced to make the following admissions:—(1) Bourke is not a murderer. (2) He is not coming to Toronto. (3) The Land League whom he vilified that night are not bringing him to Canada. The first admission proves that he was in error as to character as well as to locality. I will point out a few errors in the explanation:—(1) Bourke, who is an old Toronto boy and well remembered by many citizens, was never "implicated in a plot to murder." (2) He was not tried for treason, felony but for high treason. (3) He was not "sentenced for life and liberated at the end of three years." He was sentenced to be hanged, drawn, and quartered. Subsequently the sentence was commuted to imprisonment for life, and at the end of three years, I believe, he was liberated. I make the second and third

corrections merely to show his profound ignorance of the history of the man and the recklessness with which he will make statements calculated to inflame the passions of his followers.

Will Dr. Potts "gladly make these corrections?" Was he not unwise to declare that with the exception of locality he "would not withdraw a comma or semicolon?" In his explanation Dr. Potts ventures to admit "there is room for constitutional agitation touching land laws." Why was he not honest enough to make such an admission at the anti-Home Rule meeting? Was it not called that Gladstone "might catch public sentiment?" And yet Dr. Potts, throughout the course of his lengthy address, failed to admit that Ireland had a single grievance.

I have another tid-bit for you. Further on in his explanation he says, "I would have no objection to a large measure of Home Rule for Ireland, provided there would be a similar arrangement for England, Scotland and Wales." Compare this with some of the extracts from his speech, "I stand in sympathy with the loyalists of my country because Home Rule means practical separation from Great Britain. That is what it means. It is as plain as a pikestaff that Home Rule means practical separation from Great Britain." This is not an objection merely to Home Rule as the "Nationalists understand it," but indicates a most determined opposition to it in any form. He makes this clear by this further extract, "any form of Home Rule would simply mean the insertion of the thin edge of the wedge, and total separation would follow." Will Dr. Potts please reconcile these positions? As I have made all my quotations from the Globe Sentinel, I have no doubt they will be accepted as reliable. A fear of trespassing on the crowded state of your columns compels me here to handle Dr. Potts more gently than he deserves. J. A. MULLIGAN.

THE VOTE ON MR. LANDRY'S MOTION.

On the 25th of March the vote was taken in the Canadian Commons on Mr. Landry's motion condemnatory of the execution of Riel. It was the largest since Confederation, there being present 199 members when the division took place. For the motion the vote stood 52; against 146.

An analysis of the vote on Mr. Landry's motion discloses several interesting points. By provinces the vote stood thus:

Table with 2 columns: Province, For the motion, Against it. Ontario: 18, 65. Quebec: 28, 36. New Brunswick: 1, 14. Nova Scotia: 4, 17. P. E. Island: 1, 4. Manitoba: 1, 4. British Columbia: 1, 6.

By nationality the vote of Wednesday stands as follows:

Table with 2 columns: Nationality, For the Government, Against the Government. English Conservatives: 96, 26. French Conservatives: 26, 24. English Liberals: 24, 17.

The vote against the Government stands as follows:

Table with 2 columns: Nationality, For the Government, Against the Government. English Liberals: 24, 11. French Liberals: 11, 17. French Conservatives: 17, 17.

Total: 52, 146. Taking the French vote by itself it stood as follows:

Table with 2 columns: Nationality, For the Government, Against the Government. French speaking representatives voting against the Government: 28. French speaking voting for the Government: 26. Majority against the Government: 2.

The Ontario Reformers who voted for Mr. Landry's motion were Messrs: Allen, Glen, Armstrong, Harley, Blake, Landerkin, Cameron (Huron), Miller, Cameron (Middlesex), Mills, Campbell (Renfrew), Somerville (Bruce), Cook, Trow, Ridgar, Wells, or seventeen in all. The eighteenth man from Ontario who voted for the motion was Mr. Labrosse, of Prescott. The Ontario Reformers who voted against the motion were Messrs:

Table with 2 columns: Nationality, For the Government, Against the Government. Mackenzie, Paterson, Cartwright, Bain (Wentworth), Charlton, Somerville (Brant), Sutherland (Oxford), Livingston, Gunn, Livingstone, Platt, Spring, McCraney, Jackson, Innes, Mulock, or fifteen in all. Nine other English-speaking Reformers, viz, Messrs. Scriber, Ray, Davies, Gillmor, King, Barpee, Fisher, Irvine, and Watson (Manitoba), also voted against the motion.

The members absent were Messrs. Catudal, Cameron, (Victoria) McNeill, Cockburn, Fairbank, Fleming, McDonald, Thompson, (Haldimand) and Sir John A. Macdonald. The government naturally feels rejoiced over its great Parliamentary victory. The opposition were certainly outgeneraled in the fight, and they badly worsted. Had Mr. Blake drawn swords in the debate on the address, his defeat would have been stronger, and his case less grievous. As there is no rose without a thorn, no sunshine without a shadow, neither is there in this world any victory without a check. On the very day that the House of Commons was being put in martial array for the fight, the particulars of which we have just recited, there took place in the counties of Drummond and Arthabaska an election for the local legis-

lature of Quebec. The issue was Riel and nothing but Riel. These counties in 1882 gave a Conservative majority of 610. On Wednesday, the 23rd, they elected the Liberal candidates, Mr. Girouard, by a majority of 386, notwithstanding that his opponent had pledged himself in writing against the execution of Riel.

Of this election the Montreal Herald (Conservative) says: The Montreal Herald, (Ind.) discussing editorially the result of the election in Drummond and Arthabaska says:—Mr. Prefontaine's chances as a candidate would not have been worth considering at all had he not taken the course he did, since the Riel feeling in Quebec may do its worst throughout the province. This is the true state of things, and the Drummond and Arthabaska election is but a sample of the whole, whatever those interested in putting a different color on the situation may say or sing. What do its members of parliament from Quebec may do is one thing; what the sentiments of the electors at home may be quite another thing. If the existence of this condition of things is considered of sufficient gravity to justify an appeal to the people of the Dominion and a general election, well and good. There is just one thing more to be considered, and that is that in the event of a general election this summer the government party in Quebec province will be utterly extinguished. If the object of the government men in the other province is to win out in a general election, fifty Romanists in England. On a recent Sunday Pastor Berthe, of Brest, received thirty converted Catholics at the Lord's Supper. The Presbyterian Church at Valparaiso has added to its membership during the present year one hundred and fifty Catholic converts. Father O'Connor of New York reports twenty-two converts from Rome under his preaching between January and July. Rev. R. B. Desroches, of Detroit, who left Rome while training for its priesthood, has established six churches, mostly of converted Catholics; and he does not know that any ever went back. Among his converts have been priests and monks.—The Christian Leader.

Admitting for the moment that these figures are correct, what do they prove? We direct our correspondent's attention to an incident in the Life of Jesus Christ Himself. It is recorded of Him that addressing the Jewish multitude He said: "I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world." The gospel then adds, "The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying: How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" Did these doubts of the Jews affect the truth of His doctrine, or shake His purpose to preach it and adhere to it? He suffered them to pronounce his exposition thereof a hard saying, and many of his disciples to leave Him and walk with Him no more rather than explain away one iota or tittle of his solemn and divine teaching. Who the losers by the blindness of the Jews and the apostasy of His disciples? They themselves or Jesus Christ?

St. Jude's memorable words were also recorded to memory: They are, he says, cloudlets without moisture, borne hither and thither by every wind, withered trees of autumn, sterile, twice killed, decimated, waves of a furious sea, upraising the foam of their shame; wandering stars, for which a tempest of darkness is reserved for all eternity.

Nubes sine aqua quae a ventis circumferuntur: arboribus autumnales, infructuosae, bis mortuae, eradicatae: fluctus feri maris, desuper sus confusiones, sidera errantia, quibus procella temerarium servata est in aeternum.

We beg of our esteemed contemporary, the Northwest Review, to hold us excused from not giving more prompt attention to its paragraph of the 6th of March last. Our contemporary then said: "The Catholic Record has sharply taken to task the Le Canadian for some remarks it made in reference to the course pursued by the Toronto Mail in which the Canadian held Mr. Farrar, the chief editor, responsible. With great force and truth the Record points out that Mr. Farrar is not responsible, being subject to the dictates of the managing editor, Mr. Bunting. After granting all this the question still arises, does the managing editor hold sway over the consciences of his writers, in other words, does the chief editor at the sacrifice of truth obey the wishes of his manager, as the Mail certainly did the other day when it assailed the teaching of the Catholic Church. We would be pleased to hear what our learned friend has to say on this phase of the question."

The question put us by our Winnipeg friend is an entirely fair one, and to it we give a very plain answer. No managing editor, say we, should hold such sway over the consciences of his writers as to force them to sacrifice truth to obey their wishes. No Catholic writer can, in safe conscience, or, more plainly, without grievous sin, make such a sacrifice at any one's bidding. Our object in taking the stand we did in regard of the Canadian and Mr. Farrar was not indeed to defend the Mail, nor its chief editor, from any of the blame justly attaching to both for their assault on Catholicity. But we did think, and do think still, that in the particular circumstance to which we at the time made reference Le Canadian did not assume a fair position towards Mr. Farrar, and expressed ourselves accordingly.

lie Church any body of men who call themselves by the name of Christ, who thus publicly show themselves to be so entirely ignorant of the first principles of the religion they profess. Yours, etc., Toronto, March 19. VERITAS.

What reliance is to be placed on this "Monsignor" theory can be inferred from the alleged feat to give his name lest he should deny authorship of the forged letter. If the letter were genuine no regard for persons, nor fear of denial by the author, would prevent the publication of his name.

In reference to the allusion of Veritas to General Burke, we may say that, admitting that brave officer to be as glibly as Veritas pretends, admitting that Catholics are as blood-thirsty as he assumes, he is out of his own mouth proven a murderer of truth and an assasin of reputation. Need Catholics fear the assaults of such men, nay, in them they should glory. Our allusion to apostasy reminds us that some time ago a correspondent enclosed for observation and comment the following clipping:

"COMING OUT OF ROME—In every land Catholics are coming out of Rome. Since Mr. Foulkes returned from the Romish priesthood to the Anglican Church he has received the recognition of fifty Romanists in England. On a recent Sunday Pastor Berthe, of Brest, received thirty converted Catholics at the Lord's Supper. The Presbyterian Church at Valparaiso has added to its membership during the present year one hundred and fifty Catholic converts. Father O'Connor of New York reports twenty-two converts from Rome under his preaching between January and July. Rev. R. B. Desroches, of Detroit, who left Rome while training for its priesthood, has established six churches, mostly of converted Catholics; and he does not know that any ever went back. Among his converts have been priests and monks.—The Christian Leader.

Admitting for the moment that these figures are correct, what do they prove? We direct our correspondent's attention to an incident in the Life of Jesus Christ Himself. It is recorded of Him that addressing the Jewish multitude He said: "I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world." The gospel then adds, "The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying: How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" Did these doubts of the Jews affect the truth of His doctrine, or shake His purpose to preach it and adhere to it? He suffered them to pronounce his exposition thereof a hard saying, and many of his disciples to leave Him and walk with Him no more rather than explain away one iota or tittle of his solemn and divine teaching. Who the losers by the blindness of the Jews and the apostasy of His disciples? They themselves or Jesus Christ?

St. Jude's memorable words were also recorded to memory: They are, he says, cloudlets without moisture, borne hither and thither by every wind, withered trees of autumn, sterile, twice killed, decimated, waves of a furious sea, upraising the foam of their shame; wandering stars, for which a tempest of darkness is reserved for all eternity.

Nubes sine aqua quae a ventis circumferuntur: arboribus autumnales, infructuosae, bis mortuae, eradicatae: fluctus feri maris, desuper sus confusiones, sidera errantia, quibus procella temerarium servata est in aeternum.

We beg of our esteemed contemporary, the Northwest Review, to hold us excused from not giving more prompt attention to its paragraph of the 6th of March last. Our contemporary then said: "The Catholic Record has sharply taken to task the Le Canadian for some remarks it made in reference to the course pursued by the Toronto Mail in which the Canadian held Mr. Farrar, the chief editor, responsible. With great force and truth the Record points out that Mr. Farrar is not responsible, being subject to the dictates of the managing editor, Mr. Bunting. After granting all this the question still arises, does the managing editor hold sway over the consciences of his writers, in other words, does the chief editor at the sacrifice of truth obey the wishes of his manager, as the Mail certainly did the other day when it assailed the teaching of the Catholic Church. We would be pleased to hear what our learned friend has to say on this phase of the question."

The question put us by our Winnipeg friend is an entirely fair one, and to it we give a very plain answer. No managing editor, say we, should hold such sway over the consciences of his writers as to force them to sacrifice truth to obey their wishes. No Catholic writer can, in safe conscience, or, more plainly, without grievous sin, make such a sacrifice at any one's bidding. Our object in taking the stand we did in regard of the Canadian and Mr. Farrar was not indeed to defend the Mail, nor its chief editor, from any of the blame justly attaching to both for their assault on Catholicity. But we did think, and do think still, that in the particular circumstance to which we at the time made reference Le Canadian did not assume a fair position towards Mr. Farrar, and expressed ourselves accordingly.

lie Church any body of men who call themselves by the name of Christ, who thus publicly show themselves to be so entirely ignorant of the first principles of the religion they profess. Yours, etc., Toronto, March 19. VERITAS.

What reliance is to be placed on this "Monsignor" theory can be inferred from the alleged feat to give his name lest he should deny authorship of the forged letter. If the letter were genuine no regard for persons, nor fear of denial by the author, would prevent the publication of his name.

In reference to the allusion of Veritas to General Burke, we may say that, admitting that brave officer to be as glibly as Veritas pretends, admitting that Catholics are as blood-thirsty as he assumes, he is out of his own mouth proven a murderer of truth and an assasin of reputation. Need Catholics fear the assaults of such men, nay, in them they should glory. Our allusion to apostasy reminds us that some time ago a correspondent enclosed for observation and comment the following clipping:

"COMING OUT OF ROME—In every land Catholics are coming out of Rome. Since Mr. Foulkes returned from the Romish priesthood to the Anglican Church he has received the recognition of fifty Romanists in England. On a recent Sunday Pastor Berthe, of Brest, received thirty converted Catholics at the Lord's Supper. The Presbyterian Church at Valparaiso has added to its membership during the present year one hundred and fifty Catholic converts. Father O'Connor of New York reports twenty-two converts from Rome under his preaching between January and July. Rev. R. B. Desroches, of Detroit, who left Rome while training for its priesthood, has established six churches, mostly of converted Catholics; and he does not know that any ever went back. Among his converts have been priests and monks.—The Christian Leader.

Admitting for the moment that these figures are correct, what do they prove? We direct our correspondent's attention to an incident in the Life of Jesus Christ Himself. It is recorded of Him that addressing the Jewish multitude He said: "I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world." The gospel then adds, "The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying: How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" Did these doubts of the Jews affect the truth of His doctrine, or shake His purpose to preach it and adhere to it? He suffered them to pronounce his exposition thereof a hard saying, and many of his disciples to leave Him and walk with Him no more rather than explain away one iota or tittle of his solemn and divine teaching. Who the losers by the blindness of the Jews and the apostasy of His disciples? They themselves or Jesus Christ?

St. Jude's memorable words were also recorded to memory: They are, he says, cloudlets without moisture, borne hither and thither by every wind, withered trees of autumn, sterile, twice killed, decimated, waves of a furious sea, upraising the foam of their shame; wandering stars, for which a tempest of darkness is reserved for all eternity.

Nubes sine aqua quae a ventis circumferuntur: arboribus autumnales, infructuosae, bis mortuae, eradicatae: fluctus feri maris, desuper sus confusiones, sidera errantia, quibus procella temerarium servata est in aeternum.

We beg of our esteemed contemporary, the Northwest Review, to hold us excused from not giving more prompt attention to its paragraph of the 6th of March last. Our contemporary then said: "The Catholic Record has sharply taken to task the Le Canadian for some remarks it made in reference to the course pursued by the Toronto Mail in which the Canadian held Mr. Farrar, the chief editor, responsible. With great force and truth the Record points out that Mr. Farrar is not responsible, being subject to the dictates of the managing editor, Mr. Bunting. After granting all this the question still arises, does the managing editor hold sway over the consciences of his writers, in other words, does the chief editor at the sacrifice of truth obey the wishes of his manager, as the Mail certainly did the other day when it assailed the teaching of the Catholic Church. We would be pleased to hear what our learned friend has to say on this phase of the question."

The question put us by our Winnipeg friend is an entirely fair one, and to it we give a very plain answer. No managing editor, say we, should hold such sway over the consciences of his writers as to force them to sacrifice truth to obey their wishes. No Catholic writer can, in safe conscience, or, more plainly, without grievous sin, make such a sacrifice at any one's bidding. Our object in taking the stand we did in regard of the Canadian and Mr. Farrar was not indeed to defend the Mail, nor its chief editor, from any of the blame justly attaching to both for their assault on Catholicity. But we did think, and do think still, that in the particular circumstance to which we at the time made reference Le Canadian did not assume a fair position towards Mr. Farrar, and expressed ourselves accordingly.

lie Church any body of men who call themselves by the name of Christ, who thus publicly show themselves to be so entirely ignorant of the first principles of the religion they profess. Yours, etc., Toronto, March 19. VERITAS.

What reliance is to be placed on this "Monsignor" theory can be inferred from the alleged feat to give his name lest he should deny authorship of the forged letter. If the letter were genuine no regard for persons, nor fear of denial by the author, would prevent the publication of his name.

In reference to the allusion of Veritas to General Burke, we may say that, admitting that brave officer to be as glibly as Veritas pretends, admitting that Catholics are as blood-thirsty as he assumes, he is out of his own mouth proven a murderer of truth and an assasin of reputation. Need Catholics fear the assaults of such men, nay, in them they should glory. Our allusion to apostasy reminds us that some time ago a correspondent enclosed for observation and comment the following clipping:

"COMING OUT OF ROME—In every land Catholics are coming out of Rome. Since Mr. Foulkes returned from the Romish priesthood to the Anglican Church he has received the recognition of fifty Romanists in England. On a recent Sunday Pastor Berthe, of Brest, received thirty converted Catholics at the Lord's Supper. The Presbyterian Church at Valparaiso has added to its membership during the present year one hundred and fifty Catholic converts. Father O'Connor of New York reports twenty-two converts from Rome under his preaching between January and July. Rev. R. B. Desroches, of Detroit, who left Rome while training for its priesthood, has established six churches, mostly of converted Catholics; and he does not know that any ever went back. Among his converts have been priests and monks.—The Christian Leader.

Admitting for the moment that these figures are correct, what do they prove? We direct our correspondent's attention to an incident in the Life of Jesus Christ Himself. It is recorded of Him that addressing the Jewish multitude He said: "I am the living bread which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world." The gospel then adds, "The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying: How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" Did these doubts of the Jews affect the truth of His doctrine, or shake His purpose to preach it and adhere to it? He suffered them to pronounce his exposition thereof a hard saying, and many of his disciples to leave Him and walk with Him no more rather than explain away one iota or tittle of his solemn and divine teaching. Who the losers by the blindness of the Jews and the apostasy of His disciples? They themselves or Jesus Christ?

St. Jude's memorable words were also recorded to memory: They are, he says, cloudlets without moisture, borne hither and thither by every wind, withered trees of autumn, sterile, twice killed, decimated, waves of a furious sea, upraising the foam of their shame; wandering stars, for which a tempest of darkness is reserved for all eternity.

Nubes sine aqua quae a ventis circumferuntur: arboribus autumnales, infructuosae, bis mortuae, eradicatae: fluctus feri maris, desuper sus confusiones, sidera errantia, quibus procella temerarium servata est in aeternum.

We beg of our esteemed contemporary, the Northwest Review, to hold us excused from not giving more prompt attention to its paragraph of the 6th of March last. Our contemporary then said: "The Catholic Record has sharply taken to task the Le Canadian for some remarks it made in reference to the course pursued by the Toronto Mail in which the Canadian held Mr. Farrar, the chief editor, responsible. With great force and truth the Record points out that Mr. Farrar is not responsible, being subject to the dictates of the managing editor, Mr. Bunting. After granting all this the question still arises, does the managing editor hold sway over the consciences of his writers, in other words, does the chief editor at the sacrifice of truth obey the wishes of his manager, as the Mail certainly did the other day when it assailed the teaching of the Catholic Church. We would be pleased to hear what our learned friend has to say on this phase of the question."

The question put us by our Winnipeg friend is an entirely fair one, and to it we give a very plain answer. No managing editor, say we, should hold such sway over the consciences of his writers as to force them to sacrifice truth to obey their wishes. No Catholic writer can, in safe conscience, or, more plainly, without grievous sin, make such a sacrifice at any one's bidding. Our object in taking the stand we