

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

Published weekly at 21 and 23 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

NOTES.—REV. GEO. B. HORTON, Editor.

THOMAS GURRY, Publisher and Proprietor.

MRS. DONAT GURRY, LK. KING and JOHN KING are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transmit all other business to the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Agent for Ontario—F. J. O'Day, Esq.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion.

Approved by the Bishop of London, and recommended by the Archbishop of St. Boniface, the Bishops of Ottawa, Hamilton, Kingston, and Peterborough, and the Ontario Clergyman throughout the Dominion.

All correspondence on business should be addressed to the Proprietor.

Persons writing for a change of address should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Catholic Record.

London, Ont., Jan. 14th, 1888.

PRINCIPAL AUSTIN AGAIN.

A letter appears in the *Mail* of the 3rd inst. from the Rev. Professor R. F. Austin, Principal of Alma College, St. Thomas, in which, though he does not attempt to prove his former statements regarding Convent Schools, he makes some reference to the reply we gave in our issue of 22nd of October last to his slanders against them. The Professor would have shown more wisdom not to have referred to that controversy at all, inasmuch as after nearly three months' incubation, the only answer to us which he has succeeded in hatching out is contained in the following few words of his last letter:

1. Some of the Catholic papers "have thought my articles worthy of three column editorials."

2. None of them have "challenged my statement that nearly one thousand Protestant pupils are educated in the Roman Catholic convents of Ontario."

3. They "have not dealt fully or fairly with the main issue presented in my articles," but they "have abused" Mr. Austin instead.

4. "One Editor," (i.e. of the *Record*) "declares my efforts are prompted by a desire for dividends to stockholders: that I am personally interested, etc."

Will any candid reader say that by these references to us, he has sustained the gross accusations which in his former communication he made against the Convent Schools of the Province?

He maintained that the Convent Schools are inferior to the Protestant boarding schools in buildings, staff, equipment, and results. We showed categorically that his statement was false, and now he has not a word to say in proof of his position. Was not this one of the main issues presented in his article? Was it not in fact the main issue? Was it not the chief reason by which he tried to convince Protestants that they act unwisely in sending their children to convent schools? Mr. Austin, by his silence, acknowledges that we proved our point, and, therefore, his present statement that we substituted abuse for argument on his main issue is deliberately false. Are the Protestants of Ontario reduced to such a condition that they require to be instructed by a trickster who can make use of pleadings so contemptible? As to his accusation that we abused him, we acknowledged that we proved that he stated what was untrue. If he thinks proper to call this abuse, he is free to do so; but in our article there was nothing else that could be called by such a term. We say now that Professor Austin has by his last letter proved that either he is incapable of seeing the force of an argument, or that he deliberately misrepresents it. He may choose which ever horn of the dilemma best suits him; but when he appeals to the sympathy of his co-religionists by pretending that he is abused, we think they will have penetration enough to appreciate such buffoonery at its true value.

Let us now deal with his references to this journal. That which we have numbered 3, we have sufficiently dealt with. In 1 he accuses us of writing a three column reply to his letter. In fact there was very little difference between the length of his letter and of our reply: still if we thought proper to deal "fully and fairly with his main issues," as we did, he has no right to complain. If we had not done so we would have given him some reason for the false accusation which he has made in number three. This sufficiently justifies us in having devoted to him the space we gave to the consideration of his letter. This space, however, was much less than three columns.

In 2 he triumphantly states that we have not denied that one thousand Protestant pupils are educated in Catholic Convent Schools. We did not, and do not think the statement worth denying. If it be true, it sufficiently manifests the falsehood of the Professor's "main issues," the inferiority of Convent schools, and the new issues raised in his last letter that "the good sisters shamefully attempt to pervert the faith of Protestant pupils in attendance: for it is incredible that if either of these statements were true, forty Protestant children or more would be in attendance at every convent boarding school in Ontario! Yes: forty at least is the number, if

the Professor is to be believed; for the convent boarding schools do not exceed twenty five in the province. We may remark, however, that it does seem that the professor is somewhat hyperbolic in these figures, just as he was when he stated that the convent schools "outnumber" the Protestant boarding schools five to one. The truth is the Professor's fancy furnishes his facts.

4 The Professor's last reference to us is the complaint that we accused him of writing against convent schools because the stockholders of Alma College want to secure dividends, and that, therefore, the Professor takes this means of advertising his institution. Now we have positive knowledge on this point. The Professor does not straightforwardly deny that this was his object, and we know that the stockholders did bring pressure to bear to have the stock pay better. By making a casus of the *Mail's* No-Popery tendencies the Professor does a good stroke of business in getting free advertisements. If, however, the public were aware of the interior discipline of the institution, to which we already made some allusion, the advertising might not bring much profit to the mill. It is not, however, our business to expatiate on this subject.

Principal Austin now states that "a greater or less percentage" of the one thousand Protestant pupils become Catholics. His unscrupulousness in statistics, already proved above, and in our former article, is further exemplified by comparing the present with his former statement, that "one-tenth become converts to Romanism." This is false: and he virtually acknowledges this by modifying the statement to the very indefinite expression "a greater or less percentage."

This is somewhat different from the ten per cent. of his former letter. Yet he pretends that the two statements are identical. Is this honest? He no longer maintains that the Convent schools are established mainly for the purpose of proselytizing Protestants: yet he has not the candor to acknowledge that their real purpose is the education of Catholic girls.

Is this honest? Why should the Convents refuse to extend the advantages of a good education to Protestants, if they apply for it? If they would do so, they would be abused as illiberal, but because they do not, Professor Austin abuses them as institutions established expressly for purposes of proselytism. The Professor's falsehoods against the Bishop of Kingston are not worth refuting anew. They have already been proved on unimpeachable testimony to be slanderous. At all events they have nothing to do with the subject at issue, "Convent Schools." Mr. Austin's reference to them now merely shows that his malice and malevolence are so irrepressible that they must be vented on some person, whereas in the consciousness that he is arguing in a bad cause, he cannot give valid reasons for his gross attacks.

It is well known that the convent school teachers do not interfere with the religious convictions of Protestant pupils given to their charge. The Protestant parents who send their children to them are perfectly aware of this; and as Principal Austin now acknowledges that "our Roman Catholic friends guard the faith of their youth," the natural inference is that they guard their morals too. Protestant parents know this; and in spite of Professor Austin's calumnies, they know that the convent schools are supplied with teachers of the highest order, and with every equipment needed for imparting a most complete education. Herein lies the secret of their desire to secure the advantages of these schools for their children.

THE BEAUTIES OF ALIEN RULE.

The Dublin *Telegraph* throws new light on the manner in which Ireland is governed. It is positively stated that the only reason on account of which the County of Meath was proclaimed under the Crimes' Act was the opposition of the farmers to a plan of Lord Londonderry, the Viceroy, to hunt in the County. The Viceroy rented a hunting seat lately, and a farmers' convention hearing of this, resolved not to allow hunting ever there. The county was thereupon proclaimed. As Meath was one of the most peaceful counties in the country, and free from crime, there is a *prima facie* case made out against the Viceroy, that the *Telegraph's* statement is correct. At all events it is certain that there was no more valid reason than this for the proclamation.

In Dublin there was no better reason either; and according to the *Telegraph*, Dublin was proclaimed with the obvious intention of intimidating the press. But "the best laid schemes of mice and men gang oft agley."

And the Dublin press refuse to be intimidated. A strict Parliamentary enquiry should be instituted into all these matters. The light of day should be made to shine upon these hidden deeds of darkness. Further: Mr. Blunt's trial was begun at Portlanna on the 4th inst. Mr. Sheehy, M. P., appeared in the prison garb as one of Mr. Blunt's witnesses. The Right Rev. Dr. Duggan, Bishop of Clonfert, Messrs. Shaw Le Fevre, Evelyn, Moineau, Rowlands, and Patrick O'Brien, members of

Parliament, a large number of distinguished English visitors, and many priests were present. Policeman Walpole, one of the Crown's witnesses, admitted on cross-examination that if Mr. Blunt had a right to remain on the platform, he did not read the police more than was necessary. The case of the Crown is so far considered as highly favorable to Mr. Blunt. During the trial the police outside of the Court amused themselves by endeavoring to exasperate the great crowds of people who had assembled to be present at the trial; and so scandalous was their conduct that one of the Englishmen present, Mr. Macaulay, of Colchester, entered the court and complained to the judge against what he described as the most wanton conduct he had ever witnessed. Eye witnesses describe the conduct of the police as that of a set of blackguards. This, however, is just what we might expect, for the police know what the "don't hesitate to shoot" and "don't hesitate to swear" Government expect from them.

A COLLAPSE.

There is now no doubt that the Salisbury Government made the clumsy and mean effort already reported in our columns, to endeavor to suppress the Nationalist agitation in Ireland, by holding out a bait to the Pope and to the Irish bishops, which might induce them to condemn the Nationalist cause, an event which, it was hoped, would demoralize the patriotic party, and as a natural consequence lead to the breaking of the united front now presented against the Coercionists. It has been revealed by Mr. Justin McCarthy, the patriotic statesman who now governs the Empire, were not so long ago, ready to grant to Ireland any measure of Home Rule which would satisfy the Nationalists, though now they declare that such a concession would dismember the British Empire and weaken it among the nations of the earth. If their representations are correct, they were willing to betray their country for the sake of the Pope and the bishops. It is no wonder that they imagined that the Pope and the bishops could be brought to betray their most sacred charge, for traitors ever judge that all others are as ready as themselves to barter away their convictions for lucre's sake.

But the Government have found that they calculated the bill without the host. King John, Henry VIII., Napoleon, and other Princes, in vain endeavored to move the successor of St. Peter from the path of rectitude. God has "conducted the just through the right ways," and neither Pope Leo XIII. nor the Bishops of Ireland could be induced to side with the persecutors of a patriotic people. At no period have the Bishops of Ireland been more patriotic and more united with their people in their demand for just government than at the present time, and it will be found that bribes will not purchase them.

The meanness of the Governmental attempt to make use of our Holy Father's influence to attain their end is enhanced by the fact that one of their most oft-repeated arguments against "Home Rule" was that it means "Rome Rule," and now they wish to employ "Rome Rule" in order to strangle "Home Rule." Mr. Chamberlain during his "visit to Ireland," as it is called, made it his staple argument against granting self government to the country, that the men of Ulster would thus be abandoned to the tender mercies of a majority dominated from Rome: and his cry was the burden of the song of the Conservative journals and speakers from Land's End to John O'Brien's. It is humiliating to a self-respecting public that their rulers should now be begging at the feet of that same authority which a few weeks ago they were representing as the quintessence of tyranny and foreign domination.

Here is what the *Pall Mall Gazette* says upon the subject:

"We are informed that there is some substratum of fact beneath the announcement yesterday by the London correspondent of *United Ireland* concerning the design of the government in settling the Irish question. Briefly speaking, they wish to checkmate Home Rule by Rome Rule. Baffled as they are by the steady, passive resistance offered by the Irish people to their arbitrary and exasperating administration, followed in their calculation that the implementation of the leaders of the constitutional party would throw the game into the hands of the extremists, and despairing of all other methods of saving the union, they have determined to strike up an alliance with the Pope of Rome. It has for some time been an open secret that Lord Salisbury contemplated some such concordat with the Vatican, and in this he was strongly encouraged by the Duke of Norfolk and that section of the Irish landlords who follow the lead of his Grace. Until recently, however, it was feared that the Pope was too shrewd and too well informed to act as emergency man for the Tory Coercionists."

The *Gazette* goes on to describe the government mode of operating. "Word was given in Tory circles that the Pope Eavoy, Monsignore Pernice, was to be taken in hand, and that every effort should be made to nobble his Excellency by profuse hospitality and the most deferential treatment." A hint was to be given to Mgr. Pernice

that priests who would attend Nationalist meetings would be imprisoned; but that the Government would gladly spare the Holy Father such a grave scandal, provided the priests were warned not to identify themselves with the Nationalists. Next, the Government would endow a Catholic University for the benefit of the Irish Catholics.

Lord Harrington's special mouthpiece, the *London Observer*, gives further details of the plot, and is really sanguine that its issue will be just what is desired in Unionist circles. This journal deems it neither "impossible nor undesirable for her Majesty's Government to arrive at some understanding with the Vatican for the adoption of a common attitude towards the Separatist movement in Ireland," because "there is no doubt, it seems to us, that the Head of the Catholic Church would be able to afford us material assistance, which we could legitimately accept in counteracting the mischievous designs of the Nationalists."

The *Observer* enters then upon the conditions on which negotiations might presumably be successful. The temporal interests of the Catholic Church, in Ireland, this journal thinks, would be the basis on which an agreement could be arrived at, satisfactory to both parties. There would be diplomatic representation of England at Rome. Catholic University Education could readily be conceded by the Government, and even they might go so far as to "bring the Irish Catholic priesthood into direct stipendiary connection with the State," thus "freeing them from absolute dependence on their flock, and giving them a permanent material interest in maintaining good relations with the executive government."

The plot was undoubtedly adroitly conceived in some respects, but it lacked one important element to secure success. It overlooked the fact that the Irish priesthood are one with the people in the demand for the just Government of Ireland by Irishmen, and that they before now rejected with scorn advances made them on nearly identical terms. The Bishops and priests of Ireland are as unpurchasable now as they were then.

The result of all these negotiations has been their sudden collapse. The Duke of Norfolk went to Rome, indeed, to offer our Holy Father the queen's congratulations on the occasion of his jubilee; and so far he was graciously received. But when the question was for the Holy Father to interfere with Irish National aspirations, the Duke was at once informed by Cardinal Rampolla that His Holiness could not forbid the Irish priests to be patriots. Thus the negotiations collapse.

"All at once, and nothing first, just as bubbles do when they burst."

The whole transaction may be summed up in the following graphic words from *United Ireland*:

"The outspoken utterances of the *Free-man* and Mr. Dillon, M. P., in support of our own declaration, promptly put it in evidence that the position of the Irish Catholic people and clergy on this question is as clear and firm to-day as it was when O'Connell described it so emphatically. All is well, thank God, and in the midst of their sufferings and trials the Irish people and the Irish priests will celebrate the blessed Christmas with hearts as full of mutual love and trust, with faith as strong and patriotism as ardent as at any period of their history."

THE CAUSE STILL PROGRESSING.

Sir Thomas Grove, M. P., for Wiltshire, hitherto supporting the Government, as a "Liberal Unionist," is the latest member of Parliament who formally renounces adhesion to the Coercionists. He is disgusted with the manner in which the Crimes Act is being enforced. The *Echo*, the evening organ of the Liberal Unionists, commenting on the fact says: "The Government have only themselves to thank for a result. They may be propped up for a period by the Liberal Unionists, but they will ultimately avail them but little. If a powerful Liberal Government, with the united force of the Conservative party at their backs, failed in the application of drastic exceptional legislation for Ireland, how can the present Government with four-fifths of the Liberals in opposition, expect to succeed?"

The *Echo* goes on to show that the imprisonment of such men as the Lord Mayor of Dublin, Wm. O'Brien, etc., instead of weakening the Irish cause, gives it new strength, by furnishing it with a class of men whose influence over the people will be the greater because they are "invested with a martyr's fame." The article continues:

"The greatest enemy of the Government at the present moment is Mr. Bal-four. The men, however, who will ultimately be held most responsible for the Act and its administration are the men that the Government will soon see the mistakes they have made, and hack back to a policy of pacification and safety. If not they will, in our judgment, make a bad matter worse, contract their power of usefulness, shorten their period of life, and weaken the Union they so passionately profess to protect."

This is what Mr. Gladstone has been telling the people of England, ever since the voice of Ireland was so unmistakably heard proclaiming her demand for Home Rule: it is what the friends of Ireland

have always insisted on, viz., that a policy of conciliation and unity would do more, in a short time, to consolidate the Empire, than centuries of coercion have effected or ever will effect. There is consolation in the fact that even the blind are beginning to see the truth of this.

Even Sir John Arlott, proprietor of the *Irish Times*, which had only abuse for the Nationalist party, and laudations of the Government for its vigor in enforcing the Coercion Act, has declared his disapproval of the brutal treatment inflicted on political prisoners; though in his case there is reason to believe that he is influenced rather by the fear that his business would suffer from his anti-Irish proclivities, than from that sense of justice and fair play which were the cause of the other conversions to the cause of Home Rule.

Mr. Grove states in his letter defining his position, that the Government engaged that the Crimes Act would be applied only for the prevention of crime, and not for political purposes. This promise they have not fulfilled, and consequently he cannot further support them.

THE CHURCH IN QUEBEC.

"Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the Leopard his spots?" Whatever may be the answer to this query, it appears to be impossible for the *Mail* to lay aside its antipathy to everything French-Canadian, and especially to the Church in the Province of Quebec. In its issue of the 4th inst. an article against "monopolies," a subject which has certainly no connection with the French Canadian question, begins with a cloud of dirt thrown at the Church in Quebec.

"In Quebec, the *habitant* who demurs to paying tithes and assessments is said, in plain English, to be disloyal to God. The theory is that the *Infante* has ordained that the common people there shall toil and toil in order to maintain a standing army of ecclesiastics, whose wealth in worldly possessions is seven fold greater than that of the richest banking Corporation of Canada."

This is a wilful misrepresentation of facts, and an unjust stinging out of the Catholic Church on which to vent his spleen, whereas with greater justice almost any Protestant denomination in Canada, whether of Ontario or Quebec, would be amenable to the *Mail's* maledictions, if there be any justice in it at all.

It is not that we suppose that any reader of common sense will be deceived by the absurd insinuations and statements contained in the above extract, that we propose to put the matter in its proper light here, but because we wish our readers to be informed even of the ludicrous and nonsensical attacks which are made on religion, especially those which are repeated constantly into our ears, of which class so many have appeared in the *Mail* since that journal began to ride the No-Popery hobby.

The Catholic population of Quebec was 1,170,718 by the last census. The largest Protestant denomination in Ontario, "the Methodist Church of Canada," numbered 436,987 adherents. Now there is nothing very remarkable about the fact, if it be really a fact, as probably is the case, that the Church property belonging to over a million Catholics should exceed in value that belonging to four hundred thousand Methodists. In this sense, it is very likely that the Catholic Church in Quebec is "richer" than the Methodist Church in Ontario, though we have not, and probably never has the *Mail*, the detailed statistics which would prove this to be the case. But if the *Mail* means to say that the Catholic Church of Quebec is one corporation, he insinuates a falsehood. The Church in Quebec is divided into eight dioceses, which, financially, are perfectly distinct from one another, as much so as the Methodists from the Presbyterians or the Church of England. In the sense, therefore, of distinct corporations holding property, it is false to assert that the Catholic Church in Quebec is enormously more wealthy than the Protestant denominations of Ontario.

Unitedly, it may be presumed that all the Catholic dioceses of Quebec together hold more property than any single Protestant denomination in Ontario; but for aggressive purposes, it is the boast of the Protestant denominations that they are one in purpose. If the comparison is to be made, then, as a reason whether for purposes of spoliation, or for the sake of showing the aggressive power of the respective Churches, we have a perfect right to insist that while all the Catholic dioceses of Quebec are lumped together, all the Protestant denominations of Ontario shall be lumped also. What, then, will be the result? Excluding Pagans and those of "no religion" we find the Protestant population of Ontario to be, by the same census, 1,568,169, being in excess over the Catholic population of Quebec, 415,451.

We may very reasonably suppose that this Protestant population in this wealthy Province possesses more Church property than do the Catholics of Quebec. If, therefore, a crusade is to be started against the holders of Church property, it would be becoming in the *Mail* to begin with the

Protestant churches of Ontario, instead of leveling all his arrows at the Catholics of Quebec.

Besides: as the editor of the *Mail* is himself a citizen of Ontario, it would seem to be somewhat more of his business to redress the wrongs of the people of his own Province rather than to be constantly poking his nose into the concerns of another Province with which he can have nothing to do except as assuming the role of an impertinent intermeddler. Charity, you know, begins, or should begin, at home.

But for what purpose does the Church in Quebec possess so much property? The *Mail* answers: "the common people there toil and toil in order to maintain a standing army of ecclesiastics" who are immensely wealthy. This is certainly a falsehood, and almost certainly a deliberate one. It is well known that the clergy of Quebec, for the most part, live simply and frugally on moderate incomes, and that their personal receipts are much smaller than are enjoyed generally by the Protestant ministers in Ontario, and what they do receive they well earn by their assiduous labor for the spiritual and temporal welfare of their flock. Of the Church property in Quebec, a great part consists of cemeteries, orphan asylums, hospitals, and other charitable institutions. The Protestants of Ontario have such establishments too, and more costly to their supporters, for the amount of work done, than the similar institutions in Quebec. Many of the schools in Quebec are likewise Church property, and in not a few cases the ecclesiastics referred to by the *Mail* are teachers who surely deserve support from their occupation, equally with the "army" of school teachers who make their living by their profession in Ontario. The remainder of the Church property consists of Churches which have been erected, not for the sake of enabling the priests to lead luxurious lives, but for the use of the people, and to enable them to adore God in a decorous manner. Moreover, it is almost certain that *per capita*, the value of the Protestant Church buildings in Ontario is greater than that of the Church buildings in Quebec. The *Mail's* charges, therefore, lack truth, decency, honesty and propriety. If, as seems to be the case, he is entirely opposed to the building of the Churches, for God's honor, there is a substratum of an intelligible purpose in his unwarranted attack upon the Church in Quebec, but even in this he would show more honesty if he began the onslaught in his own Province. We have had, before now, occasion to point out the open infidelity of which the *Mail* has frequently been the advocate, and if he means to apply the principles he is now advocating equitably to Protestants as well as Catholics, it is easy to see that he is playing into the hands of infidels, and arguing their cause as earnestly now as he has done in the past.

In conclusion, we may well ask: Is the appeal to the "Infante," which the *Mail* makes so frequently, in a trivial and bad cause, fit reading for a Christian public who accept with reverence the precept of the Decalogue: *Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain*?

GOLDEN JUBILEE OF FATHERS DOWD AND TOUPIN.

An interesting volume in memory of the auspicious event above indicated has been issued from the printing house of John Lowell & Son, Montreal. It is the work of J. J. Curran, Esq., Q. C., M. P., and it contains a historical sketch of the Irish Catholic community of Montreal, together with concise biographies of the Pastors of Rosollet and St. Patrick's Churches of that city. It is, for the most part, compiled from documents which relate to the Golden Jubilee, but it contains also several original sketches of great interest, not only to the Catholics of Montreal, but necessarily to the whole Catholic people of Canada. Coming from the pen of the well-known and deservedly respected eloquent member for Montreal Centre, it would naturally be expected that this little memorial book would be a gem, both as regards the matter it contains and the manner in which it is collated, and the expectations of those who read it will not be disappointed. The work is full of most interesting information concerning the progress of religion in Montreal and its vicinity, and as Montreal occupies a leading position in Canada not only as the great commercial centre of the Dominion, but also as a centre of Catholicity, the information given in the volume before us is of most general interest. In another column will be found much relating to the city which will be very interesting to our readers. We will therefore merely state here that the able and eloquent sermon of His Lordship Right Rev. J. Walsh, Bishop of London, will be found entire in Mr. Curran's book. This will make it an especially desirable acquisition to Catholics of London dioceses.

The Rev. Fathers Dowd and Toupin were ordained to the holy priesthood on the 19th May, 1837, hence their golden jubilee, the fiftieth anniversary of their priesthood, occurred on 19th May, 1887. These fifty years were spent in assiduously

laboring for the spiritual and temporal welfare of the Catholic community; especially during the sad period when Irish immigrants to Canada were stricken down by thousands by that dread scourge the typhus fever, the self-sacrificing spirit of the Montreal priesthood was evident to the most inattentive observer. Father Dowd, being at that time charge of the Irish population of Montreal, was one of the many heroic priests who exposed themselves to the danger of contagion by ministering to the wants of suffering Irish population which at time landed on our shores. Father Toupin has also been for many years identified with the Irish people of Montreal, strongly recommending to our readers beautiful memorial of two such devoted priests.

PETERBOROUGH'S OFFERING THE PAPAL JUBILEE.

THE HOLY FATHER REMINDS THE DIOCESE His Lordship the Bishop of London (who kindly consented to be the bearer of a special message of homage from the Bishop of Peterborough to the Father, and who carried with him the jubilee offering of this diocese amounting to one thousand dollars) writes from the Holy City under date December 16th, 1887, to His Lordship Bishop Dowling as follows:

MY DEAR LORD—I have the pleasure of informing you that I have been to place in the hands of the Pope the special offering of the diocese of Peterborough which your Lordship committed to my care. His Holiness was much pleased and charged me to press his thanks to the bishop, and faithful of the diocese of Peterborough, adding that he thereon bestowed upon them the Apostolic Benediction.

THE POPE'S JUBILEE.

The Jubilee Pontifical Mass passed great splendor and rejoicing. thousand people were given tickets of admission to St. Peter's Church, was packed for the first time since erected. The Pope entered the church with the Cardinals and was hailed with shouts of "Long live the Pope." music was most affecting. The blessed people, after which the Pope gave every demonstration of alarm. King Humbert said to a momentary deputation that he was with the smoothness of the ceremony which was the best proof of the liberty: as if his being not in with for one day constituted There were present forty-eight Cardinals and two hundred and thirty-eight bishops and Bishops. While upon the sacred vestments it was said Pope faltered twice, but soon recovered. This report has since been authorized. He wore the triple crown presented to him by the Emperor of Austria. Special Masses in honor of the Jubilee were celebrated throughout Britain.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

GENERAL HERMAN KANGLER, head of the Pontifical army, is reported to have said:

The report that the Pope fainting fits before the Jubilee authorities is denied.

The Spanish Government will \$100,000 a year to the creation for the Columbus celebration.

It is estimated that 750,000 were drowned and 3,000,000 less by the overflow of the Yellow River in China.

The removal of the remains of III, and the Prince Imperial hurried to Farnborough took Monday.

Mr. Gladstone having expressed to visit the Pope, the Holy Father said that he will be delighted to distinguish English statesman.

A French Protectorate has been claimed in the Wallis Islands. Chevreton, the French resident appointed Minister to the natives.

In two London churches been invited to read the lesson of the successive Sundays lately satisfaction to the audience.

The Oscar in his congratulatory to the Pope, said he was desirous of the interests of his Catholic to harmonize the needs of with the fundamental principles Russian Empire.

The parties accused of the Legion of Honor decoration of the Paris tribunal again on 1st when the prosecutor announced had fresh evidence implicating and the case was further ad-

PRESIDENT CARNOT sent his ambassador, Count de Bala, graph letter to the Pope, Holiness long life and expressing the hope that the between France and the Pope continue on the basis of the