

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.

Messrs. Luke King, John Nigh, F. J. Neven and Joseph N. King, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, agate measurement.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of Hamilton, Peterborough, and Ogdensburg, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.

Articles must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

When subscribers change their residence it is important that the old as well as the new address be sent us.

London, Saturday, September 3, 1898.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF KINGSTON.

The announcement made last Monday that the Very Rev. Vicar-General Gauthier, of Brockville, had been selected by the Holy Father to fill the vacant Archbishopric of Kingston, will be received with glad acclaim, not alone in the section named, but throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion. Since the death of the Most Rev. Dr. Cleary—the great and distinguished Churchman who was loved and revered wherever known throughout the Catholic world—there seemed to be a feeling that the Holy Father would most likely make selection of the great and good parish priest of Brockville to fill the vacancy.

Archbishop-elect Gauthier is the seventh Bishop, and second Archbishop of Kingston. He at once, on receipt of the Bull, becomes Administrator of the diocese, succeeding the Right Rev. Mgr. Farrelly of Belleville, who was appointed Administrator by Archbishop Cleary. The Most Rev. Dr. Gauthier was the choice of the clergy of the Archdiocese, who unanimously nominated him, requesting of the Holy See to select him to the office. It is understood also that his was one of the three names selected by the Bishops and forwarded to Rome as being suitable for the position. The Holy Father has seen fit to approve of the selection of the clergy, and it may be taken as an indication of the desire of the Holy See to meet their wishes, as far as possible, in the appointment of Bishops.

Hitherto there has been no provision made in Ontario for the expression of the opinions of the priests in regard to the election of Bishops, but in nearly all long-settled countries such a provision exists, as in England and Ireland, and it has been introduced also with success into the United States. The choice of the priests of Kingston was the first effort made in this province to make the wishes of the priests known in this regard.

We know it would be far from the wish of the new Archbishop to have anything in the shape of fulsome praise applied towards him on the present occasion, nevertheless with all our heart we say that we believe the choice to be a most happy one—that we believe the great archdiocese of Kingston will be blessed in its new chief pastor—that we believe that the great and good work of upbuilding the Church will go on as vigorously and as prudently as ever—that we believe in this work he will have with him to strengthen his hands and bring consolation to his great Catholic heart, the good wishes and the active co-operation of all the priests and of all the people of the Archdiocese of Kingston. His administration in Brockville has been blessed with singular success in every particular. May we not hope that his administration in the larger field will be equally blessed and equally successful.

That he may be spared for many years to continue the good work is the heartfelt prayer of the editor of the CATHOLIC RECORD.

BASILIAN REPRESENTATIVES.

The Rev. M. Fergusson of the Basilian order, and well known as one of the professors of Assumption College, Sandwich, has been chosen, with the Very Rev. Father Marjion, Provincial of the same Order in this country, to represent Canada in the election of a Superior General of the Basilian community, to succeed the late Very Rev. Father Adrian Fayolle, whose death was chronicled in our columns some weeks ago. The election will take at Annony, France, on October 11.

Two more able representatives of the order than those who have selected could hardly be found. Father Fergusson, beside being an eminent scholar and teacher, is well known as an eloquent preacher. The two gentlemen will visit Rome after the

election, and will, doubtless, be received by the Holy Father.

The Toronto dailies had an erroneous and absurd account of the object of their visit to Europe, stating that it was to take part in the selection of successors to the late Archbishops of Toronto and Kingston, and to Cardinal Taschereau of Quebec.

BISHOP WILLIS CRITICIZED.

A Honolulu paper makes some funny remarks concerning a decree recently published by Bishop Alfred Willis, condemning the use of cassock and cotta by girls who belong to vested choirs. The Bishop, who is an Episcopalian, founds his objection on the passage in Deuteronomy which forbids women to "wear that which pertaineth unto a man." The newspaper critic remarks that it is also said in Deuteronomy, "thou shalt not wear a mingled stuff, wool and linen together," and "thou shalt make thee fringes upon the four borders of thy vestment." He adds that if the dress of choir girls should be regulated by the Mosaic law, so should the dress of all other persons, and the Bishop himself should wear a fringe on his coat, waistcoat and trousers. The critic quotes his right of private judgment as successfully as the Bishop.

IMPROVEMENTS IN THE VATICAN.

Pope Leo XIII. is full of the spirit of the progress of the age, and he investigates in person the preparations which are being made for the lighting of the Vatican by electricity. At his suggestion the Aquilone waterfall on the Vatican grounds will be utilized to provide the motive power to the dynamo. The water that supplies this cascade is brought from the Lake of Bracciano, twenty-five miles from Rome. The plant for the lighting of the Vatican will not be completed till toward the end of the year, and by the beginning of next year it is expected to be in full operation. Eventually, the Basilica of St. Peter will also be lighted both within and without by means of an extension of the electric wires throughout the great building.

THE IRISH LOCAL GOVERNMENT BILL.

A defeat suffered by the Salisbury Government in the House of Lords on the Irish Local Government Bill, in the direction of extending the benefit of its provisions, would appear to indicate that the campaign of the Liberals to educate the people up to the necessity of doing justice to Ireland, has had a good effect even in educating the peers to this point also. Only six Irish cities were indicated in the Government bill as county boroughs, namely those which have a population of 20,000. Lord Morris, an Irish Catholic peer, and a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, moved to add Galway to this list, though the population of that city is only a little over 17,000. Lord Dunraven supported Lord Morris' motion, but Lord Ashbourne, on behalf of the Government, opposed it on the ground that the line must be drawn somewhere else all the small towns would demand the same privilege. Lord Morris pressed the matter to a vote, and his motion carried by a vote of 67 to 62. As the Government is sustained by a very large majority in the House of Commons, this defeat in the House of Lords does not force it to a resignation.

CHURCH UNITY.

A paper furnished by the Rev. Charles Garrett to the Methodist Times, on Christian Unity, and copied into the columns of the Christian Guardian, shows the loose ideas now entertained by many Protestants in regard to the nature of the Church as instituted by Christ, and the fact that organs of Methodism give publicity to these views, as a matter for the instruction of their readers, shows that the organs are of the same opinion with the writer. Hence we may infer that the loose views to which we refer are very prevalent.

The writer speaks of "the visible Church," but the whole purpose of his article is to show that the real Church of Christ is not bounded by the limits of any one denomination, but includes the members of all denominations, who profess to believe in Christ, whatever may be their doctrinal differences.

He endeavors to prove his theory by the words of Christ: "And other sheep I have which are not of this fold," and to show that we have correctly interpreted his contention we may quote the following:

"If I had the whole of Christ's Church before me to-day I would undertake to set them by the ears with a single question: 'What think ye of Baptism?' What a hubbub there would be! And when that had subsided, I would undertake to set forth their unanimity another question: 'What think ye of Christ?' They would simultaneously agree that He was the fairest among ten thousand and altogether lovely. Of this Church Christ is head. He will add to the Church. . . . He admits and enrolls, and He only can expel. You can turn me out of your churches, but no power can turn me out of Christ's Church."

The theory here maintained is unmistakable. There is no power on earth which can define what doctrines Christ has revealed, and which can declare that such doctrines should be believed under penalty of voiding that faith "without which it is impossible to be saved." Every man is free to believe what he thinks proper concerning baptism, or any other ordinance of Christ. He may, with High Church Anglicans, believe that baptism regenerates the soul, and that it is necessary for salvation; or, with Low Churchmen and the congenial sects, Presbyterians, Methodists, etc., that this sacrament is a mere symbolical form without regenerating efficacy, or with the Baptists, that the baptisms of all other sects than their own are useless, being not administered according to the mode prescribed by Christ; or, with the Quakers, that baptism and the whole sacramental system is a mere superstition. This is where "the hubbub" comes in of which the Rev. Mr. Garrett speaks, and he considers it to be of no importance what belief is entertained on the matter. Yet we have the words of Christ declaring the necessity of baptism: "He that believes, and is baptized, shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be condemned." (St. Mark xvi, 16,) and "except a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (St. John iii, 5.)

It is clear, then, that Christ has instituted baptism, and has made it obligatory on all to receive it in order to become Christians. Neither will any baptism suffice, except the sacramental baptism which Christ instituted, for we find in (Acts xix : 3, 5,) that disciples at Ephesus who had been baptized "in John's baptism," had still to be baptized "in the name of the Lord Jesus," that is with the baptism of Jesus Christ. The contention of Mr. Garrett that it is a matter of no consequence what we may believe concerning baptism, is, therefore, a dangerous error imperiling souls; and the same is to be said of indifference to other revealed truths. To make them a matter of indifference as he does, is to deny the Eternal Truth of God who has revealed them to mankind for His own wise purpose.

Mr. Garrett's theory implies also that there is no supreme tribunal or authority in the Church of God, having the right to condemn erroneous doctrines, and to exclude from its fold those who obstinately maintain such doctrines. This also is contrary to the manifest nature of the Church as by Christ established. Christ tells us that whosoever "will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican." This text refers to an offence given by a brother, but the offence may be by teaching false doctrine as well as against the code of Christian morals, and general authority is given to the Church to decide upon all such matters. Hence, Christ on this same occasion tells His apostles:

"Whatever you shall bind upon earth shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven."

The theory which Mr. Garrett maintains was evidently invented for the purpose of cloaking the dissensions of Protestantism, and making it appear that all the sects have a unity in Christ, though they differ on every point of doctrine. This is simply a lame effort to show that the principle of private interpretation of Scripture does not lead to absurdity or destroy the substantial unity of the Church of Christ. It is plainly to be seen that such a theory makes the Church a Babel of errors, instead of being "the pillar and ground of truth" which St. Paul describes, it to be in 1 Tim., ii, 15.

The text of Scripture quoted by Rev. Mr. Garrett to uphold his doctrine is lopped off short that it may seem favorable to his theory. Christ said: "Other sheep I have which are not of this fold." But Mr. Garrett forgets that Christ adds that He must bring these sheep together, so that there shall be one fold and one shepherd. This leaves no room for the many sheepfolds which would be contained within Mr. Garrett's boundless enclosure.

Mary, as the pattern both of maidenhood and maternity, has exalted woman's state and nature, and made the Christian virgin and the Christian mother understand the sacredness of their duties in the sight of God.—Cardinal Newman.

THE ANCIENT AND MODERN CHURCHES OF ENGLAND.

Some Anglicans are very anxious to reverse the teachings of true history, and to prove that the Anglican Church has had a continuous existence in England since the time when Christianity was first established in the country in the reign of the British King Lucius by missionaries sent by Pope Eleutherus in consequence of a request made by the King that Christian teachers should be sent to evangelize the country.

The baptism of King Lucius took place in A. D. 183, and it is easy to understand why Anglicans are so anxious to make it appear that the Church then established was entirely independent of Rome and the Roman Pontiff. They have a theory that from the beginning every nation had an independent Church, and on this ground they maintain that the Church of England owes no obedience to the Pope, and that the claim of the Pope to be the head of the universal Church is a usurpation.

This view is held by Mr. Charles L. Ingles, of Toronto, in a letter which appeared in the Mail Empire of the 22nd ult., under the title, "Early Anglicanism." The Mail had said in an article on Ritualism a few days before: "In justification of their Ritual, they (the Ritualists) cite the practices of the sixteenth century when the English Church was coming into being."

Mr. Ingles maintains that "There is no fact plainer in the history of England than the existence of the English Church prior to the Reformation. The Church in England prior to that time was not known by the name of the Roman Church, or by any other name than the Church of England." He wishes it to be inferred from this that the modern Church of England or Anglican Church is identical with the Church which existed in England previous to the schism inaugurated by Henry VIII. In proof of this he cites "the great charter of English liberties which Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury, at the head of the barons, obtained from King John when he (John) had brought both the Church and nobles of England under the power of the Bishop of Rome." He continues: "The very first provision of Magna Charta, after the preamble, is, 'Ecclesia Anglicana libera sit.'" (Let the Church of England be free.) He then draws the inference that the English Church did not "come into being in the sixteenth century."

The fallacy and absurdity of Mr. Ingles' reason will be at once palpable to our readers. In the first place, there is no reason why the Church in England should have been called the "Roman Church," for that is not the name whereby the Catholic Church is and always has been known. The Roman Church is that part of the Catholic which is in the city and diocese of Rome.

Mr. Ingles lays great stress upon the fact that the Magna Charta declares the freedom of the Church of England; but in wishing us to believe that this means that it was to be independent of the Supreme authority of the Divinely Instituted Head of the Universal Church, he is greatly mistaken. It had been the custom of many kings to interfere with and impede the administration of Church affairs by the ecclesiastical authorities, whose function of governing the Church had frequently been usurped by monarchs, both in England and on the continent. It was the freedom which St. Thomas A. Beckett contended for—freedom from royal interference, that was guaranteed by the first article of Magna Charta. A Church freed from interference by the King or State, is a something very different from the modern Church of England, which is the creature of the State, and is to this day entirely subject to the laws enacted by the State, which has formulated even the articles of faith which Anglicans are supposed to believe.

Mr. Ingles rightly says that Stephen Langton was Archbishop of Canterbury. He would have us believe that the so-called Archbishop of Canterbury of to-day is his lawful successor, but such is not the case. Langton derived his Archiepiscopal authority from the Pope, though the King's assent was given to his appointment, and it was owing to the firm attitude of the Pope in insisting upon the recall of Langton to England, and his restoration to his See, that King John allowed him to return from the exile to which he had consigned that illustrious Archbishop.

Mr. Ingles lays great stress upon the fact that the "Church of England" is the one named in Magna Charta, and his conclusion is that it had no connection with Rome. He forgets that in the same great charter of liberties, Stephen Langton is named not only as Archbishop, but also as "Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church." Here, then, is the acknowledgment that the "Church of England" is subordinate to the universal authority of the Pope.

But why was the Church called the "Church of England," and not at least "Roman Catholic," if it was really subordinate to the Pope? The reason is not far to be sought. Before the Reformation there were a few sects, some in one country, others in another, such as the Lollards, Wickliffites, Albigenes, Vaudois or Waldenses, Hussites, Brethren of Bohemia, etc. But these were comparatively few in number, and confined mostly to one locality, and no one dreamed of regarding them as "Churches." In the whole West, at all events, there was but one Church universally diffused and known as "The Church," or "The Catholic Church," as it is designated in the Apostles' and the Nicene Creeds. The portion of the Church in any particular country was designated by the national appellation, and thus we read of the French Church, the Spanish, the English, the Scotch, and the Irish Churches; all parts of one great organization, subject to one Divinely appointed visible head, the Pope. Bishops of the Church of England met in Council with those of other countries, as all were of one communion. Hence, in the Acts of the Councils of Arles and Sardis, held respectively in 314 and 347, are found the names of British bishops who were present, and with the bishops of other countries, recognized the universal authority of the Pope as undisputed and indisputable.

It was never necessary to designate the Church as the "Roman Catholic Church," and that is not its name to this day. It is simply Catholic. The term Roman has been used merely in Protestant English law to designate the Catholic Church, under the absurd pretence that without it there might be some mistake, inasmuch as all the new sects claim to be the Catholic Church of the Apostles' Creed.

It is clear, then, that the modern Church of England has its name solely by having stolen it, and by the force of English law which so designates it, but it is not the Church of England of ancient times. It differs from the ancient Church of England in all the essentials of a Church. It has a different head, a different doctrine, a new liturgy and ritual, and an erratic rule of faith.

The ancient Church of England, or rather the Church of Britain, was established by missionaries from a Pope, and endured down to the days of St. Augustine, when the Saxons were converted. St. Augustine received his authority as primate from Pope Gregory, just as his predecessors had received it from Pope Eleutherus, and so the succession continued until Henry the 8th established a new Church, because the Pope would not accommodate the doctrines and practices of the Church to his lustful desires.

The real successor to the ancient English Church after this period was the Catholic Church, persecuted though it was, until a very recent date.

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE AND DIVINE HEALING.

We have had occasion several times to call attention to the evils resulting from the doings of a superstitious sect calling themselves "Christian Scientists." This sect has established itself in several cities of the United States and Canada, and recently a church has been established in Toronto for the purpose of propagating the principles of the sect.

The distinctive doctrine of this sect is, that the power of miraculous healing by prayer alone was given to the Church of God, and is still possessed by faithful disciples, the use of medicines and following the advice of physicians being deemed contrary to God's law. It is true that miraculous healing may and does sometimes take place. The numerous cures which have occurred from time to time at shrines of the Blessed Virgin and other saints, as at Lourdes, St. Anne of Beaupre, and more recently at St. Anne's Church of New York, are evidences that the hand of God is not shortened, and that He still manifests His power by miracles wrought in testimony to the truth of His holy religion. But to de-

mand, or to expect miracles from God whenever we deem it proper, is to tempt God, and against such a practice Christ Himself warns us by reminding the great tempter that "it is written, 'Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.'"

Christ sufficiently condemns the error of the Christian Scientists when He says: "They that are in health need not a physician but they that are sick." Almighty God also approves the use of medicines when He declares through the Prophet Ezechiel: "The fruits (of the trees by the torrent) shall be for food and the leaves thereof for medicine."

The deliberate neglect of calling in physicians when Christian Scientists have been given charge of patients suffering from serious maladies has so frequently been followed by death, when the sickness might have been readily cured by proper physicians, that we can only wonder at the infatuation of those who allow themselves to be duped by these quacks, who have made their superstitions into a form of religion. These cases of neglect have been frequently before the courts for trial, both in Canada and the United States; but notwithstanding the exposure of the frauds practiced, there are still found people willing to be imposed upon, and to pay their money for being cheated.

This so-called Christian Science consists in the absence of all scientific treatment of diseases, but there is a feature of it which makes it much more worthy of condemnation than it would be if this were all; for it is made the basis of the denial of Christ's divinity and of revealed religion, and it thus becomes a blasphemy.

Christian Science is in fact one of the many vagaries which result from the Protestant principle of private judgment, but so far as we are aware, its votaries have no special antipathy to the Catholic Church, such as some other sects entertain. There is, however, another sect which has existed for a few years in Chicago, commonly designated as "Divine Healers," holding the same distinctive doctrine as the Christian Scientists, but differing from these inasmuch as they profess a firm belief in the Bible and in Christ's divine character. These sectarians, judging from a paper which they issue under the name, "Leaves of Healing," are animated by a most diabolical hatred of the Catholic Church. This is, perhaps, not to be wondered at, because their dangerous superstition is very properly condemned by the principles of Catholicism, as we have explained above in reference to Christian Science, improperly so called.

The "Leaves of Healing," however, abuse the Protestant sects, Lutheranism, Presbyterianism, Methodism, etc., with almost as much virulence as Catholicism, and even for the Christian Scientists the Divine Healers entertain a special hatred, though this sect so much resembles their own.

We would not take notice of this lying sheet, except for the purpose of putting Catholics on their guard against giving it any encouragement or support. A great effort is being made to circulate it among Catholics, especially in the North-eastern parts of Ontario, but it is fit for nothing but to be thrown into the fire.

According to this sheet, which is published by the head of this new sect, one Rev. John Dowie, there are hundreds of miraculous cures effected by the methods already described, and by anointing with oil after the manner described by the Apostle St. James in his epistle, chapter V., verse 14. But the Divine Healers abolish the sacrament of extreme unction, instituted chiefly for the salvation of souls, and pretend that their anointing heals all manner of bodily ailments. From the information we have received, their pretended cures are merely impudent deceits.

A feature of this publication is the gross ignorance of the editor, or wilful misrepresentations where Catholic doctrine is referred to. We need only mention one or two of these misrepresentations. It was actually stated in Church on June 11th by this audacious slanderer that a certain priest told a woman, who afterward joined the Healers, that she would go to Purgatory and remain there forever! Of course, all our readers are aware that Catholics believe Purgatory to be essentially a place of temporary, and not of everlasting punishment. We are also told seriously that after receiving extreme unction, the patient who is thus prepared for death must be allowed to die, and for this purpose must not eat!

Surely, this Mr. Dowie must think that the Catholics to whom he mails

this nonsense are as ignorant or malevolent as himself.

It would be a crime against faith, hope, and charity for any Catholic to subscribe for or support a journal made up for the most part of such palpable and mischievous falsehoods.

It is claimed that there are twenty-six Divine Healing Churches or missions in existence. The number is small; but even so, there are many.

THE CHOICE OF ROME.

Vicar-General Gauthier of Brockville Archbishop Elect of Kingston.

(Special Despatch to the Globe.)

Kingston, Aug. 28.—At 1 o'clock yesterday the documents from the appointing Vicar General C. H. Gauthier, of Brockville, Archbishop of the Archdiocese of Kingston arrived. Rev. Father P. O'Brien of the P. personally carried the documents to Brockville last night and presented them to the Archbishop elect. Mr. Gauthier's Cathedral to day Vicar General Thomas Kelly announced the appointment. Vicar General Kelly remarked that the prayers of the people had answered, and the glad tidings well received. In the appointment Vicar Gauthier two points were of importance. He was the unanimous choice of the priests of the diocese, secondly, while the Catholic priest people would loyally receive any nation, it was highly satisfactory that a prelate had been selected from the diocese. The late Archbishop C. and Vicar-General Gauthier about the same age when appointed the See of Kingston. After high in the Cathedral to day a solemn Deum was chanted in thanksgiving for the appointment of Kingston. The Archdiocese of Kingston consecration will probably take place in October.

THE ARCH BISHOP ELECT.

Brockville, Aug. 28.—The large beautiful church of St. Xavier was crowded at the 10 o'clock service to day, when it was expected that Vicar-General Gauthier, bishop-elect of the Diocese of Kingston, would make formal announcement of his appointment to the people's parish, whose spiritual interests were watched and guarded well with care and anxiety during the two years. Father Raller, of w. conducted the service and high Mass. The Archbishop spoke briefly. He announced the decision of the Holy See regarding himself, and asked the prayers of the people. It was only late last night that he had received the official word from the Holy See. He hoped, he appreciated, as he the mark of confidence bestowed on the high honor conferred by the Father in appointing him Archbishop of the venerable See of Kingston, second oldest in the Dominion, oldest in the Province, and should be grateful, as he was; on the hand he felt keenly in his very and no words could express his emotion as he thought of the responsibility that it involved, the anxiety it ably connected with it, and the help, and solicited the prayers of the people. He then referred to the years they had been together in relation of pastor and flock, and had been happy years, indeed. As he continued to speak of the kindness, generosity and faithfulness of the people of Brockville parish, the able prelate was almost overcome with emotion and there was scarce eye in the congregation. Concisely he asked their pardon if he speak longer. The announcement came so suddenly that although wholly unexpected it was a shock to him, and he did not condition to be so ordained priest 24, 1867, by the late Dr. Bishop of Kingston, in St. Baptist Church, Perth.

Father Gauthier was soon pointed director of his alma where his brilliant attainments quired for him a host of friends professors and students. In fore leaving for the Vatican His Lordship Bishop Horan's Father Gauthier to the imposition of Gananogue, which then Brewer's Mills, Lansdowne, and many of those Canadian islands that lend grandeur to the St. Lawrence the five years of his ministry, repaired and improved the city Gananogue and Howe Island out the contract for the stone Lansdowne. He, moreover, Barnaby's Church, Brewer's prepared that part of his parish for the reception of pastor. In January, 1875 Gauthier was appointed to the Rev. John O'Brien, D. D., to

SKETCH OF HIS LIFE.

Charles Hugh Gauthier was born November 13, 1844, in the Alexandria, justly named the Catholicity in Ontario. He the rudiments of his education Brothers' School, and in 1859 Regiopolis College, then presidency of the late Dr. afterwards Bishop of Kingston. He graduated with honors afterwards appointed professor. Having completed his theology he was ordained priest 24, 1867, by the late Dr. Bishop of Kingston, in St. Baptist Church, Perth.

Father Gauthier was soon pointed director of his alma where his brilliant attainments quired for him a host of friends professors and students. In fore leaving for the Vatican His Lordship Bishop Horan's Father Gauthier to the imposition of Gananogue, which then Brewer's Mills, Lansdowne, and many of those Canadian islands that lend grandeur to the St. Lawrence the five years of his ministry, repaired and improved the city Gananogue and Howe Island out the contract for the stone Lansdowne. He, moreover, Barnaby's Church, Brewer's prepared that part of his parish for the reception of pastor. In January, 1875 Gauthier was appointed to the Rev. John O'Brien, D. D., to