

TWO CATHOLIC CONVERTS.

NEW BRUNSWICK CLERGYMEN ABJURE PROTESTANTISM.

Some weeks ago a special despatch to the Gazette from St. John, N.B., announced that Rev. Finlay Alexander, M.R., C.S. (Eng.), Episcopal dean of Fredericton, and Professor Stockley, of the University of New Brunswick, had abjured the Protestant faith and embraced Catholicism. Protestant circles were considerably worked up over this announcement, but in many quarters it was discredited.

There is now no room for doubt on the matter. Yesterday morning these two gentlemen formally abjured their former faith and took their first vows in the Catholic Church before His Grace Archbishop Fabre.

The two gentlemen mentioned have been in Montreal for about two weeks receiving religious instruction at the hands of Rev. A. Jones, of the Society of Jesus, a professor of St. Mary's College. When the news of their formal abjuration was received the college was closed, and on no pretext could the rev. fathers be seen. The whereabouts of the two gentlemen has been kept secret, and it is understood that they wished to avoid having the matter made public in the press. Consequently neither of the gentlemen could be found.

At the Archbishop's palace no one was desirous of going against the wishes of the two converts. However the Gazette obtained a confirmation from a gentleman whose authority cannot be doubted. Seeing that the matter was known he did not desire longer to conceal it.

Everything being in readiness for the formal embracing of their new faith, this ceremony took place in the palace early yesterday morning. Mgr. Fabre officiating in person. The sponsor for Rev. Mr. Alexander was Mr. John Meagher, of Meagher Bros., wine merchants, 14 de Bresoles street, while Rev. Canon Bruchesi acted in a similar capacity for Prof. Stockley.

The ceremony took place in the following order: A public abjuration of the faith formerly professed, the sacrament of baptism in the form, "If you have not been baptized, I baptize you," the sacrament of penance, followed by low mass and communion.

The Rev. Mr. Alexander has a wife, now living in New Brunswick, while Prof. Stockley is a widower.

MR. ALEXANDER'S HISTORY.

Dean Alexander was born on the 17th April, 1834, at Walkhampton, near Tavistock, Devonshire, England. He is the son of the late Rev. Daniel Alexander, M.A., vicar of Bickleigh, near Plymouth, England. The Rev. F. Alexander received his educational training at Mount Pleasant House academy, Millbay road, Plymouth, and subsequently at Marlborough college, in Wiltshire. After leaving school, in 1850, he entered on the study of medicine at the Middlesex hospital, London, and in 1855 received the diploma of the Royal College of Surgeons, adding in 1857 that also of the Society of Apothecaries, Blackfriars bridge, London. After visiting the East, in the employ, as a surgeon, of the Peninsular and Oriental Company, Mr. Alexander, in 1860, came to Canada and engaged for three years in the practice of his profession at Gore's Landing, Ontario. In 1863 he married Anna Cecille, daughter of Thomas S. Gore, of Gore Mount, County Antrim, Ireland; and determining to take holy orders, removed to Cobourg, Ontario, where he pursued the studies necessary to that end, under the direction of the Venerable Archdeacon Bethune, afterwards Bishop of Toronto. In February, 1866, Mr. Alexander was admitted to the diaconate by the Right Rev. Bishop Strachan, and in May, 1867, was ordained to the priesthood. He was appointed in the first place to the curacy of Port Hope, Ontario, in 1866, and in the following year was transferred on the death of the rector, the Rev. Jonathan Shortt, D.D., to the curacy of Guelph, Ont. This appointment he held until the resignation of the rector, the Venerable Archdeacon Palmer, in 1875. In the autumn of that year the offer was made to him by the bishop of the diocese of Fredericton, New Brunswick, now metropolitan of Canada, of the position of sub-dean in his Christ Church Cathedral. This office he accepted, being subsequently made dean, which office he held up till recently.—*Gazette*.

A SPLENDID INDULGENCE

GRANTED AT THE FRANCISCAN'S CHURCH

Any person confessing and receiving Holy Communion on the 2nd day of August, can gain as many times a plenary indulgence as they visit a church of the religious, of one of either of the three orders of Saint Francis, commencing at Vespers on the 1st of August till sunset the following day. The indulgence was granted on the following occasion: St. Francis of Assisi, born in 1182, received, in 1206, the order from God to repair three churches of his native city of which one, Our Lady of the Angels, was the cradle of the Franciscan Order, founded in 1208. In the month of October, 1221, St. Francis was invited by an angel to go to this chapel where he found Our Blessed Lord, Our Blessed Lady, and a multitude of angels. It was then that Our Lord granted him the indulgence of the Portiuncula, on conditions that it was confirmed by the Sovereign Pontiff. The Pope, Honorius III., confirmed this indulgence, limiting it to one day in the year. In 1223, St. Francis, discouraged by the devil, threw himself in a bush of thorns; suddenly a heavenly light surrounded him, and the thorns were changed into roses, the angels conducted the saint to the church, where Our Lord, waiting for him with His Holy Mother, appointed the 2nd of August as the date of the indulgence. St. Francis of Assisi took twelve miraculous roses to Pope Honorius, who made public at Assisi the indulgence of the Portiuncula. In Montreal this indulgence can only be gained by visiting the Franciscan church on Dorchester street.

"ROUGH UPON" LUTHER.

PROTESTANTS OF TO-DAY PROTESTING AGAINST HIM.

Three hundred years after the miscreant's disappearance Protestants begin to tell us that although "he grasped justification by faith" (which only means that his heresy on this point suits them), "Luther was never clear upon the Lord's Supper, and that in consequence of his lack of soundness the 'Reformation' speedily fell into deadness," etc.

Now what is to be thought of this? An excommunicated man, covered with crimes which even the civil law of modern times would visit with penal servitude, and guilty also of offences against the moral code which Christianity punishes with the heaviest censures, this depraved wretch sets up to reform God's Church.

He falls, of course, into a hundred excuses and deliriums, and shows himself to be "satanized and supersatanized," and possessed by the devil body and soul.

But still he was the high priest of what is called by the very indistinct name of Protestantism. Yet now they have just found out that he was no agent from heaven, but altogether from the other place. Their reason, however, for coming to such a conclusion is not by any means the correct one—not only not the correct one, but not a reason at all. They are used to this sort of logical phantasy, so it does not much matter.

Luther would be their apostle still, in spite of the mountain of guilt under which he groaned and yet lived, to the horror even of his associate apostates; but he committed one offence which the Calvinistic hatred bred in the "English religion" can never forgive—namely, "the crucifix and the two lighted candles on the altar."

"Table"—the "convenient, movable table"—is, of course, what they mean, but they use the word "altar." Therefore, in quoting them we leave it so.

The Evangelicals wish "Presbyter Anglicanus" to know, when he speaks of the Emperor of Germany having admired the reredos, etc., at St. Paul's, and saying, "There is nothing to object to here," he has forgotten to point out that, although Luther grasped the doctrine of justification by faith, he did not adhere to the Scriptural view of the sacraments.

But who says that he did not adhere to the Scriptural view of the sacraments, but that he did "grasp rightly the doctrine of justification?"

That he did neither is, of course, perfectly certain, but who is it that, in the present instance, settles that Luther's doctrine of justification is right and his view of the sacrament wrong?

As a matter of fact, like all other heretics, Luther changed with every wind,

yet is it ridiculous for any individual Anglican, or for the whole body of Anglicans (if they could ever contrive to assemble in a body), to decide on the strength of their own piebald creed (to misuse the word) which is a mixture of cross-bred Lutheranism and the horrors invented by the murderer of Geneva, to decide on and from this that Luther was right here, but he was "deadly wrong" there, and from which it follows that Luther's Reformers are "in a state of terrible deadness."

So this is what the Low Church fragment is not ashamed to set before Englishmen (infidel or otherwise): "You must not be surprised that when in London the 'Evangelical Emperor of Germany' saw nothing to object to in St. Paul's, because Luther, though he 'grasped justification by faith, and perceived how excessively unscriptural was Rome, still was never clear on the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.'"

From which it resulted that the reformation of the "father of the 'Reformation'" lacked soundness, and, what is more terrible (Luther being "inspired by God, as we maintain, at least in public"), speedily fell into a state of "terrible deadness" from which it has not yet risen. Under all the circumstances therefore it is not to be wondered at, but only to be lamented, that when in London (etc., as above).

And these wretched Evangelicals, who publish without offering a grain of reason that Luther was right in teaching this, but heretically wrong in teaching something else, object to that authority to teach founded and fixed by God the Son Himself.

Now, we venture to think that the "crucifix and the two lighted candles" of the German Emperor's Lutheranism more than favorably contrast with the horrible profanations and sacrileges recorded in history as the leading achievements of the monsters who were stirred up to hatred of God and of everything that especially was His by the chief apostle of Anglicanism (through all its divisions)—namely, Calvin.

We also imagine that there is something better in the Emperor William's consubstantiation, absurd as it is, than in Calvin's blasphemy of the "real absence."

We are afraid, after years of entreaty mixed with oburgation, we shall have to conclude that we have labored in vain over the task of endeavoring to cure the Evangelical when he has what is called the "real black (Calvinistic) drop in him."

The leopard cannot change his spots, and the "blood poisoning" of Calvinism under its deadliest forms defies all the ordinarily established remedies. Nothing can expel this diabolical virus except a most unusual and most unmerited miracle of divine grace.—*London University*.

THE DUTY OF EMPLOYEES.

In the mysterious ways of Providence some of the noblest and purest souls are compelled to work for a living, and in that condition the eye of Catholic faith can distinguish a great blessing, as it is easier for the poor to gain the kingdom of heaven than the rich.

The duties of employees may be reduced to these two, obedience and fidelity. St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Colossians, says: "Servants obey in all things your masters." Although the terms "servant" and "master" are not much in vogue with Americans, still the conditions which they mark are as clearly defined as in any European monarchy.

The equality of man, as far as this life is concerned, is a delusion. All men are not equal, and those who work for others must obey them in all things lawful and be faithful to the trusts reposed in them. The Apostle of the Gentiles tells employees that they must not be serving to the eye, as it were pleasing men, but, as the servants of Christ doing the will of God from the heart, with a good will doing service to the Lord, and not to men. Knowing that whatsoever good every one shall do, the same shall he receive from the Lord.

It is, then, the teaching of the only Church founded by Jesus Christ that the employee must do his work, not through fear of an earthly master, but through the love of that God who told Adam that as a penalty of his disobedience he and his descendants should earn their bread by labor.

There is two classes of employees; those who are in the employ of the

Government and those who work for private firms and corporations. The first class, while in reality the servants of the people, have reversed their position, and assume to act the master, or, as it is called, the boss. These men are paid high salaries, and are even sworn to perform their duties faithfully; but if all that is said be true, and we have no reason to doubt it, very few are either obedient or faithful employees. Somehow the erroneous notion possesses the minds of politicians that the taking of pay for services that were never rendered is no sin.

It is difficult to imagine how a Catholic official can swear to such vouchers, to which he has no just claim. Such crimes have been committed, and may again be committed by men in the employ of the city; but they might as well know that they have no claim to be paid for work that they have never done.

The Government official, the man in the employ of the people, is bound to discharge all the duties of his office fully and faithfully, and if he does not, he will have to account for his remissness to the Lord and Master of all. If he is unable or incompetent he should resign, for to retain a position which one cannot fill is not merely wrong; it is an injustice and a crime.

As to the second class of employees, those who work for private individuals or firms, their duties are plain. They enter into an agreement to do certain work for certain wages, and they should do that work in an honest manner. If the relations of employer and employee were governed by the Gospel code of morality the world would be happy and the conflict of Capital and Labor would come to an end. The faithful employee, whatever his lot here on earth, will hear the voice of the Great Master saying: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant; because thou hast been faithful in a few things, I will place thee over many. Enter thou into the joy of thy Lord."

THE GAELIC LANGUAGE.

The people of Ireland at length see the necessity of preserving the national language, and realize its influence upon their nationality. This is clearly shown by the Irish Language Congress recently held in Dublin, and the notable gatherings held in various parts of Ireland under the auspices of the Gaelic League. An Irishman who is unable to speak the native speech of his country is an anomaly to be explained only by the unparalleled disasters that overwhelm the Irish people in the past; but now that they are somewhat on their feet once more they are showing that they will not allow the language of their free forefathers to be forgotten.

The movement to revive it has been slow in gaining ground, owing to the innumerable difficulties it had to encounter. The Gaelic Journal, the organ of the movement in Ireland, until recently for want of support, could only be issued five times a year. It has now come upon better times and is issued monthly.

The part the Irish in America have taken in making this improvement possible is gratefully acknowledged in the subjoined letter from Father O'Growney of St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, Ireland, editor of the Gaelic Journal, to a well known and indefatigable worker in the Irish language movement in this city. The annual subscription for the Gaelic Journal is six shillings (1.50), and may be sent direct to Father Eugene O'Growney, Maynooth, Ireland.

ST. PATRICK'S COLLEGE, MAYNOOTH, Ireland, June 3, 1894.—Dear Mr. Raleigh: I am grateful for your order of £2 17 0, and am sending the Journal to the several addresses as ordered by you. I can hardly tell you how grateful I am for the encouraging support I get from Irishmen in America; but for them the Journal, and whole series of books we are now getting ready, could not be thought of,—and this in spite of the great depression in the times, a fact which makes your generosity stand out the more. Could you give me the names of any priests who are interested in Irish? Kindly thank in my name all the kind friends of the old language to whom I am indebted, and believe me yours sincerely, EUGENE O'GROWNEY.—*Chicago Citizen*.

A close friend—The one who never lends you anything.