

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

Published weekly at 434 and 436 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVE,
author of "Sketches of Modern Ireland."

REV. WILLIAM PLANNERY,
THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor.

REV. LUKAS KIMO, JOHN WIGG and
LUKE SIOH are fully authorized to receive
subscriptions and transact all other business
for the Catholic Record.

Agent for Alexandria, Glenneville and
Leopold—Mr. Donald A. McDonald.

Notice of Advertising—Ten cents per line
each insertion.

Approved by the Bishop of London, and
recommended by the Archbishops of St.
Boniface and Ottawa, and the Bishops of
Hamilton, Kingston, and Peterboro, and
leading Catholic Clergymen 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.

Persons writing for a change of address
should inform the proprietor of the change,
and must send the name of their former
office.

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., Sept. 28th, 1889.

RAPING THE ARCHBISHOP.

Such is the heading of the Toronto Empire's report of a sermon preached in Kingston last Sunday evening by the Rev. Mr. McFadyen. The Empire has neither approval or condemnation of the minister's attack on Archbishop Cleary. But its heading to the report betrays evident satisfaction and delight that an humble parson of the Bethel Congregational Church had the pluck to make a fierce, although unjustifiable, assault on so eminent a dignitary as a Catholic Archbishop. For some reason or other the Empire has commenced a change of tactics. It was established with a view to conciliate the Catholic vote that was wrangled from the Conservative party by the no-Popery crusade of the Toronto Mail previous to the last local and general elections. And for some time the Empire adhered to a policy of feigning which meant conciliation. Lately it has thought fit to lecture Archbishop Cleary on his duties as a Church dignitary, and on the strength of a garbled report of a private address delivered by His Grace to a Catholic society, and without waiting for a correct report or some explanation of the Archbishop's words, devoted an article of remonstrance to His Grace that was wholly uncalled for and that was characterized by a rudeness and impertinence that might be expected only from the most bigoted and hostile pen. The reporter made the Archbishop say that but one sixth of the people in Ontario are Catholics, from which it might be inferred that His Grace claimed the other five-sixths as heathens or unbelievers. Had the Empire waited for the true report, his ire would have had time to cool down, and the true version would have been unobjectionable. What the Archbishop really did say was that one sixth of the people in Ontario are of the Catholic faith, the rest being schismatics or heretics. No Catholic Bishop could say otherwise, when addressing a body of Catholics. Would the Empire have His Grace promulgate some latitudinarian principle, and tell Catholic young men that they might just as well be Protestants as members of the one, true Church? Or would it have him contradict the words of Christ, and tell his hearers that they who believe not are sure of salvation, and that broad is the way and wide is the gate which leads to eternal life. The Empire's satisfaction in quoting Rev. McFadyen's attack shows its animus and Orange hoof plainly enough. This rev. firebrand, addressing the young men of his congregation, said: "After our ears having been horrified by the startling news of the past few days it is high time to arise. We are astounded that in our very midst the seeds of discord and dissension to the country are being sown. The so-called infallible oracle, mouthed by none else than the newly-created Archbishop of Kingston, hath spoken, 'may God allow the time to come that Ireland will be a nation.' Could there be a more seditious utterance? This seditious spirit was meant to be stilled for some time, but through a crack in the wall of Ireland it has leaked out."

How the Empire could have quoted approvingly and endorse such empty blather as the above can be explained only by its innate bigotry and anxiety to curry favor with the Orange lodges of the True Blue stripe. The noble sentiment and prayer so tersely and fervently uttered by Archbishop Cleary is worthy of the generous, great and patriotic soul which gives life and fire to his every word and act. We can assure the Empire and Rev. Mr. McFadyen that Archbishop Cleary's prayer to God, "that Ireland become a nation," is offered up every day by millions of lips purer than refined gold. And there is no doubt whatever but that, in His own good time, and sooner than many people imagine, the God of mercy and of the suffering will lend a propitious ear to the universal cry of all that is good and noble in Christendom, and lift up Ireland to her merited prosperity and pristine glory as a nation. "Starveling we are," continues Mr. McFadyen, "that in the very heart of our young nation the serpent of dissension to the crown is nestled, and, under the pretence

of sowing the word of life, is sowing the seeds of death." This most rabid and ignorant preacher should know that more than half of England, and the immense majority of his own people in Scotland, are in favor of Ireland's autonomy as a nation, and no more loyal men are to be found in the empire than the Gladstones, the Spencers, the Ripons and a thousand others who on all public occasions voice the same sentiment and utter the same prayer as offered in Kingston by Archbishop Cleary. Nay, we could mention the names of Orangemen living in Ireland and of preachers of the gospel of every denomination who, to hear them speak, are as anxious as Archbishop Cleary for the restoration of Ireland to her own nationhood and her own self possession. Whether McFadyen or the Empire like it or dislike it, some change must come, and come soon, in Ireland, that will put a stop, and forever, to her chronic sufferings, her periodical famines, her contempt for law as now administered—to her rack rentings and evictions and barbarities that are the scandal of the nineteenth century.

QUEBEC LIBERALITY.

The following item appears in the letter of the Mail's regular correspondent of Montreal, published in that journal on the 18th September:

"Mr. Tarte, of Le Canadian, argues that the English minority enjoy far more advantages and privileges than they are entitled to by their numbers in this province, where he asserts they have the cream of almost everything—timber, minerals, wealth, railway enterprises, the best subdivided charters, etc., all conceded to them by Governments of which the great majority have been French Canadians. In the matter of timber limits alone, he claims that of some 48,000 square miles actually under license in this province, over 45,000 miles are held by them, while French Canadians only own about 3,000 miles."

Facts like these, and many other facts of similar moral, speak more loudly of the liberality of French-Canadians, than all the empty declamations of Rev. Professor McVicar, Dr. Davidson, Q. C., Sir William Dawson and others against the fabulous intolerance of the Quebec Catholic majority. That it is fabulous is attested by Mr. Colby, M. P., and hundreds, nay thousands, of prominent Quebec Protestants. Yet there are not wanting thousands of Protestants of that Province who are ready to join with the Ontario fanatics whenever the latter think proper to raise a cry of Romish encroachments. It is claimed by the fanatics of our own Province that the 51,000 who signed the anti-Jesuit petition fully represent the Protestant sentiment of Ontario. That document is the embodiment of anti-Catholic bigotry, maligning as it does a religious order which by the eminent learning and virtues of its members has earned the veneration and love of all true Catholics. If it be true that its 51,000 signers represent the Protestants of Ontario, it must be equally true that the 8,000 Quebec signers represent the Protestants of Quebec, for they are about an equally large percentage of the Protestants of Quebec as the 51,000 are of those of Ontario. If this be the case, the Protestants of Quebec are ready to join those of Ontario in a war of creeds and races against the Catholics of the Dominion.

We do not believe that these inferences are correct, for the reason that we do not believe the premises of the fanatics, but if these assert the truth, it is worth the while of the Quebec Government and people to consider whether prudence as well as equity would not require that they should correct as far as possible the advantages which they have conferred upon a population which could be so loyal to the interests of their own Province which has so highly favored them.

Sir Edouard P. Tache pointed out, during the debate on Confederation, that "the people of Lower Canada had always acted towards the English with liberality," and he exemplified it by mentioning facts. He said: "Before the Union, while the hostilities were almost exclusively French, English Protestant gentlemen were frequently returned to Parliament, and he had now opposite to him an honorable member who had for twenty years represented an entirely French and Roman Catholic constituency." He doubted if in the course of those twenty years the honorable member had ever been asked whether he were Scotch or Protestant. They took the man for his sterling worth." He gave other remarkable instances of Lower Canadian liberality, from all of which he drew the conclusion that there is unquestionably "a great deal of French feeling on the part of the (French) electors."

About the same state of affairs has existed in Quebec ever since Sir E. P. Tache made the above statements. While in Ontario there are six Catholics out of the ninety-two members of the House of Commons, that is to say, one for every 53,473 Catholics in the Province, there are in Quebec ten Protestant members of the same House, or one for every 18,881 Protestants in that Province. In the Quebec House of Assembly there are twelve Protestants, or one for 15,692 of Protestant population, while in the cor-

responding Ontario House there are eight Catholics, being one for every 40,110 Catholics in the Province. These facts are the more noteworthy as there are only six counties in Quebec where Protestants are in a majority, Compton, Stanstead, Bromes, Missisquoi, Huntingdon and Argenteuil. In Sherbrooke and Pontiac the relative numbers approach equality, the Catholics being respectively 6,822; 11,343; the Protestants 5,399; 8,596. In all the other counties, Catholics preponderate most decisively. In Ontario, there are also six census divisions wherein Catholics preponderate, Giergarry, Cornwall, Prescott, Russell, Ottawa City, and Essex, while in two, North and South Renfrew, the numbers approach equality. It is easy to see from this where liberality exists. It is a sham when Ontario Protestants proclaim that the Catholics are encroaching on their liberties, and while a powerful faction in Ontario is proclaiming its intention to elect to Parliament or the Legislature none who will not pledge themselves to abolish Catholic schools, and to interfere with the legislation of Quebec, it behooves the Catholics of Quebec to look to it that every member of that Province shall be pledged in honor to maintain freedom of education in the Dominion, and the autonomy of that Province. "We do not mean by this that Quebec Protestants should be ostracised. Far from it. The Quebec Protestants as a rule have always stood side by side with their Catholic fellow citizens in fighting the battle of real Equal Rights. They did not, in the palmy days of bigotry, adopt the war cry of creed or race domination, which carried Ontario, and they share the glory of the victory which was finally achieved over fanaticism. We are confident that the Charles C. Colbys and J. H. Papes are to be found in Quebec in sufficient number to make Quebec a unit again in favor of religious toleration, and we guarantee that in Ontario there will be found Sir John Macdonalds, Edward Blakes, Alexander Mackenzies, J. C. Rykerts enough to win the victory once more in the contest which Dr. Davidson assures us is to be fought at the polls at the next general election. The other provinces, we believe, are still sound, except, perhaps, Manitoba. Of the result we have little fear. Courage and confidence in the goodness of our cause are half the battle, and we feel we have both courage and confidence. There was one election contest in one of the few Protestant counties of Quebec when the roar of fanaticism was loudest, but bigotry did not dare to raise its head. It was confessed that the candidates of both parties were in accord on the question of religious toleration, and no third party man presumed to raise the banner of discord. This is an earnest of what Quebec will do.

While speaking of the liberality of the people of Quebec towards their Protestant fellow citizens, we might have added what they have done in regard to Protestant education. They established a system of dissentient schools, before Upper Canada dreamed of giving Catholics a separate school system, and when Parliament did concede a measure approaching justice, it was granted only because Lower Canada insisted that the Catholics of this Province should have nearly the same privileges which were there freely accorded to Protestants.

There is great truth in Mr. Tarte's statement that the Protestants of Quebec are treated better than fairly; and it needs only that the fanaticism of some Ontario fanatics should be widespread among the Protestants of Quebec, to force the Catholics of that Province to learn some of the tactics of the Ontario persons and Orangemen, and perhaps to adopt them.

THE one-sidedness of the Equal Rights Association has another illustration in the resolutions of the Ottawa branch which met last week. The action of the Manitoba Government in proposing the abolition of separate schools was endorsed, but nothing was said for the abolition of such schools in Quebec. It makes much difference whose ox is gored. The big Toronto how-wow would take no action in regard to the abolition of separate schools, precisely because the meeting was informed that such an agitation if successful must result in their abolition in Quebec, so that it was not prudent to deal with the question. But the Ottawa branch does not care for the consequences as long as it can only strike the two Catholic minorities of Manitoba and Ontario. Yet it will not move for their abolition in Quebec. It resolves also that French must not be taught in French schools, and that only authorized books be used in them. We presume that there will be no difficulty about the last item, when a proper series of books shall have been selected and authorized by the Education Department; but it would seem that French schools ought to do the best they can until steps be taken. The object of the Equal Rights men is evidently merely to tease the French, but their impotency has been demonstrated already. The Provincial Council of the association which assembled in Toronto on the 18th inst. adopted substantially the same platform with the Ottawa branch.

FILTHY FULTON.

The letter addressed by the Bishop of Chichester reproving the Rev. J. G. Gregory, in consequence of the presidency assumed by the latter at a lecture delivered by Justin D. Fulton, styled Reverend Dr., was even more decisive than could be judged by the cable report. Fulton's lectures were delivered under the auspices of the Protestant Alliance, the subject being "Ritualism and Romanism." On August 16th he lectured in Brighton, and the Rev. J. G. Gregory, the incumbent of the Anglican Church, was presiding while Fulton said: "The Virgin Mary was not much of a Virgin." The character of the audience may be judged from the fact that the remark was received at one meeting with laughter and at another with applause. Fulton himself admitted that the report of his lecture was accurate, as regarded this expression, and at Fishergate on 21st August he justified it by remarks which the Bishop says "were even worse than the original statement."

The Bishop tells Rev. Mr. Gregory: "When a fundamental doctrine of the Christian faith is openly assailed in your presence, I hold it to be your duty to stand up for the faith as it is in Jesus, and to rebuke the gainsayer. Now, the lecturer, in attacking, and I must say vilifying, the Virgin Mary, did, in fact, attack the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ, as Holy Scripture presents it. The whole scheme of man's Redemption rests on the incarnation, and of that incarnation, the greatest of all mysteries, the Virgin Mary was the pure and holy channel. God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, but that woman, according to prophecy, a virgin. The Word was made flesh, but in a new and strange way in the womb of the Virgin Mary, by the operation of the Holy Ghost."

He then cites the creeds and formularies of the Church of which Mr. Gregory is "an ordained minister," showing that they agree in this with the words of Holy Writ. He adds:

"It is a lamentable thing that in order to expose and refute the Mariolatry so grievously prevalent in the Romish communion, the lecturer, Dr. Fulton, should speak in terms which contradict the very letter of Scripture, and not by inference only, but directly impugn the vital doctrine of the incarnation. But it is also deeply to be regretted that you should have allowed such statements to pass without rebuke or protest."

Mr. Gregory is the leader in his locality of the Low Church party, and of course is agreeable to him. This fully accounts for his silence on hearing Filthy Fulton's obscene allusions. He is undoubtedly of similar sentiments with the Wilds and Hugheses who patronized this same Fulton in Toronto, but the Bishop calls upon him to disavow Fulton's attacks upon the character of the Blessed Virgin. He says "It is amazing" that these attacks "should have been received on one occasion with laughter, on another with applause by an audience professing and calling themselves Christians."

It is consolatory to find Anglicans, who, by maintaining in the past the right of individuals to become the sole judges of faith, have encouraged all such vagaries of belief, now returning to the Christian view of the incarnation, and of the Blessed Virgin's share therein. But in reprobating the vile attacks which illiterate like Fulton make upon Catholic truth, attacks which are the natural result of Anglican vitiation of the rights of schism and heresy, it is very much out of place to screen himself, even to palliate the crime of Fulton, by misrepresenting Catholic doctrine, and calling the Catholic Church nicknames.

While speaking of Bishop Courteney's address before the Anglican Provincial Synod at Montreal, we called attention to the fact that the term "Romish," which fanatics are so fond of applying to the Catholic Church, is a misnomer. It is a mere imbecile nickname, employed by those who make up by its use for their want of valid argument against the Church. English law, which created the English Church, recognizes the name "Roman Catholic," and not "Romish" as the proper title of the Church. Anglicans who refuse at least this title to the Catholic Church acknowledge the illegitimacy of their own parentage. Besides, the term Romish is of a mongrel derivation which no scholar who knows the construction of the English language would employ, even though some dictionaries give the word in order to pandering to the bigotry of those who invented it.

But we pass over this lightly in order to come to a more serious matter, the grave accusation that Catholics are guilty of "Mariolatry." The Bishop of Chichester knows well that the accusation is false. One of his own conferees, of name far more illustrious than the present Bishop of Chichester, declares that they who accuse Catholics of idolatry do so wrongfully. But the doctrines of the Catholic Church are open to inspection by any one. The decree of the Council of Trent on the Veneration of Saints states that we adore God, and honor the saints, Mariolatry, which means the adoration of Mary with the honor due to God, is a mere invention of a pack of calumniators, though fallible Pan-Anglican Councils have adopted the term.

The Bishop merely makes the accusation

of Mariolatry as a cloak for the Protestantism of which Dr. Fulton is an admired exponent.

CHURCH OF ENGLAND SYNOD.

Last week a large gathering of Church of England ministers assembled in Montreal for the purpose of settling difficulties and of enacting by-laws for the promotion of the Church's interests in particular and for the extension of God's kingdom among men in general. Several topics of great interest were introduced and fairly discussed, but no conclusion was reached upon any one question. No by-law was enacted, no dogma proclaimed, nor was anything spiritual, or even ecclesiastical, character is concerned the synod might just as well never have been called together. The only real advantage accrued to the ministers themselves, in so far as they had a nice trip to Montreal at the expense of the Church and had an opportunity of congratulating each other on their good looks and fine appearance.

Mr. C. N. Broom gave notice of the following motion:

"That this synod recognize the evil of intemperance as one of the greatest obstacles to the spread of Christ's kingdom, and hereby express its sympathy with all proper efforts for the suppression of intemperance and the reclaiming of those who have fallen under the use of strong drink, and urges on clergy and laity to give all possible countenance to such efforts."

Seeing that more than human efforts have been made all along the line for the suppression of intemperance during the last three years, and have resulted in the death by strangulation of the Scott Act, it is difficult to imagine what benefit a bald resolution of that nature can confer upon the community. Mr. Broom is certainly entitled to credit for his good intentions, but men of experience could tell him that it would require a huge sweep of the fabled "besom of destruction" to wipe out the disastrous consequences of the defunct Scott Act.

Mr. Charles Jenkins moved a resolution "asking that a committee be appointed to consider the advisability of consolidating the various synods of the Church in Canada into one central body which should be a unit and speak with the united force of the entire Church, from the Atlantic to the Pacific. The Church of England," he said, "showed no signs of decay. The old mother was mighty yet (applause), and the Church in Canada was still growing." Canon Brickstocke seconded the motion, taking the ground "that as they were all anxious for Christian union with other churches, they should show that they themselves were united."

It is evident the Church of England suffers, as all other Protestant sects, from internal dissensions, and nothing could be more logical than Mr. Brickstocke's argument, viz., "that it is useless for them to seek for union with other churches if they cannot afford to agree among themselves." But the trouble with them, as with all other bodies lopped off from the old stock, is that they have no principle of unity, having no head to unite in, no heart to draw sustaining blood from; in fact, having no trunk to draw life giving sap from, they are doomed to wither and perish like decayed branches by the wayside. A substitute for the above resolution was offered by Mr. Walkem and adopted, viz.: "That a committee be appointed which shall be authorized to invite a conference of representatives from all the dioceses of British North America, and confer with them and, if possible, agree with them upon some ground upon which such union may be formed." And what about the Bible? Surely the Protestant rule of faith, the Bible alone, ought to be sufficient and ample ground to unite on. And what about the decalogue? And what about the ground chosen long ago by the first Apostles and handed down through all Christian ages even to our time and commonly known as "the Apostles' Creed?" These common grounds, upon which the millions in all the centuries of Christendom could agree, seem to have escaped the notice of the gentlemen composing the synod, for the resolution merely asks the Committee "to confer with the representatives of other Anglican churches and if possible agree with them upon some ground of common belief." What has Protestantism come to at last? And is it after this fashion the great old mother Church is mighty yet? Heaven help the great old mother Church—the Church of old Harry and Elizabeth—if her claspings in Canada cannot find the Bible, or the decalogue, or the Apostles' Creed, or even the Lord's Prayer as a common ground to hang a united Church on and keep it together.

The gentlemen appointed to form the expedition in search of a "common ground" are eight rev. clergymen and eight laymen. The former comprise Canon Brickstocke, Dean Norman and Dean Carmichael. Among the laymen we find Judge Benson, Mr. C. Jenkins and Mr. R. T. Walkem.

Under date of September 17th, we read:

"Last night the Anglican Synod discussed the following motion, moved by Canon Partridge, seconded by the gallant Col. Forsyth: 'No clergyman of this ecclesiastical province shall solemnize marriage in any case where there is a divorced wife or husband of either party still living. Rev. Mr. Hannington, of New Brunswick, made a powerful speech against the motion, and after several had spoken the debate was adjourned till to night. When to night came on, a lengthy debate resulted in the motion being withdrawn, and the canon referred to a joint committee of the House of Bishops and Synod to report three years from now.'

A motion in the House of Commons would be practically lost if it got what is called "the six months' hoist." But what may be conjectured of the Christian, moral and scriptural motion of Canon Partridge on "Divorce" getting a hoist of three full years? Surely the fate of that resolution is sealed forever and a day. Well, well! It is now settled and on record that the young, still-growing Church of England in Canada, with all the traditions and antecedents of the old mother Church, is not yet in a position to decide if the law which Christ laid down be the correct thing or not. Nor can its accredited ministers in synod assembled come to any decision about the morality or the lawfulness of marrying her that is put away. The great Law-giver says, in very plain terms, "that which marryeth her who is put away committeth adultery." But the house of Bishops and synod will require three full years to determine whether our Blessed Lord really meant what He said or not. And in the meantime the Ministers, Parsons, Deans and Canons may be accessories to the commission of crime the penalty of which was, according to Holy Scripture, that any one guilty of it should be taken out of the camp of Israel and stoned to death.

After the Temperance Question, the necessity of Union Question and the Divorce Question had thus been disposed of the Jesuits' Estate Act and Roman Church-Influence-in-Politics Question was introduced by Rev. Mr. Spencer, who declared "the preponderating influence of the Roman hierarchy to be dangerous and baneful," and "that it is incumbent on all good citizens, especially on Bishops, clergy and laity of the Church of England, to maintain the rights and privileges of the British people against the aggressions of the Bishops and Church of Rome: wherefore your memorialists pray that the whole matter be made by the Right Rev. Bishops of the Upper House and the clerical and lay members of the Lower House of the Provincial Synod, the subject of their earnest deliberations, to the end that some means may if possible be devised for withstanding and neutralizing the dangerous influence of the Roman hierarchy in and over the Parliament and other legislative bodies of the Dominion." The mover, seconded by Mr. Walkem, proposed to send the memorial to a committee to avoid discussion. Mr. Elliot considered this was not the proper place to discuss the question. Rev. Mr. Lewis said that debating the subject would cause agitation. They had had enough of newspaper strife to cause a rebellion. Rev. Mr. Hannington was not going to be choked off like this. He would tell them that the Jesuits' Estates question did not concern the Church of England. Self government was given to the several Provinces; the people govern themselves and the majority rules. The Province of Ontario had nothing whatever to do with the Province of Quebec on this matter. The Act was a lawful one. The Dominion Parliament and Her Majesty had put their seal to it, therefore it was useless to discuss it. He would move the following amendment: "Whereas the subject of the Jesuits' Estates Act has been recognized by the Provincial and Dominion Governments and ratified by Her Majesty, resolved that it is not a subject to be dealt with by this synod." Hon. Mr. Vail seconded the amendment, and said that he did so because he represented Nova Scotia, which was one happy family. They knew no differences down there, and he did not want to be drawn into a subject he knew nothing about. Finally the question was referred to a committee, and, like every other question introduced, it was honored by a three years' hoist.

Lively discussions, but all ending in nothing, took place on the better observance of the Lord's day, the Revised Version of the New Testament, Romish aggressions, etc., at the close of which the synod had the appearance and complexion of a veritable bear garden, for the report says that "the members became involved in a mixed discussion into which political and personal considerations entered."

Through the intervention of Pope Leo XIII. by letter to the Mikado, religious liberty is now granted in Japan, and the Church is making rapid progress in that country. The Shah of Persia has also stated to Mgr. Altmeyer, the Latin Archbishop of Bagdad, that his Catholic subjects shall always enjoy full religious liberty as long as he will reign in Persia.

THE FREE PRESS ON DIVORCE.

The London Free Press not very long ago wished a long and happy enjoyment of connubial bliss to the Hon. Mr. Foster and the divorced woman Chisholm with whom he is living. It also stated that their blissful union would be a standing protest against the laws of Canada. It never occurred to the writer in the Free Press that such cohabitation would be a standing and defiant protest against the laws of God. Much relief is brought to the Free Press by a late pronouncement in favor of a Divorce Court by Judge Armour and Sir William Ritchie, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. These learned gentlemen, however, have not spoken officially on so grave a subject and are merely credited by an Ottawa paper with entertaining loose opinions on the subject of divorce. One of them, it is said, expressed an opinion in favor of granting divorces for such causes as drunkenness or cruelty on the part of the husband, with full liberty to the wife to marry again. The Free Press is emphatic in its approval of such liberal news on the part of both judges, and declares that the non-existence of a Divorce Court in Canada is a "blot upon the judicial system of the country." If the Free Press article were avowedly written by men devoid of scriptural knowledge and Christian principle we could understand the bold position it assumes on the question of divorce. Although arguing from reason alone, the Toronto Empire and other journals of weight find thousands of difficulties standing in the way of a dissolution of the marriage tie. But when the law of God is so positive, how is it possible for men believing in Christianity to hesitate in so all-important a matter as that of divorce. All human laws are founded on the law of God. Breach of this bulwark they are nugatory, and, if opposed to God's law, they are to be held as of no account and have no binding force, because we must obey God rather than men. When grave questions of this nature are in dispute and opinion is divided, the usual course of appealing to a Supreme Judge seems to be in order. But what more authoritative Judge than the Law-giver of the Christian system, the Supreme Wisdom which declares: "That whom God has joined together let no power on earth put asunder." And when separation is permitted for certain causes, any man who marryeth her that is put away is guilty of the crime of adultery. The Free Press is astonished that its view on this subject is not shared in by other journals in Canada, or by the public men who sit in her councils. And this, we take it, can be only accounted for on the presumption that the majority of our public men, to their credit be it said, are believers in the teachings of Scripture, and that the majority of Canadian journals are conducted on Christian principles and intended to be read by communities believing in the necessity of obeying God's law. It is true that the indissolubility of the marriage tie is old-fashioned—medieval, if you will—but it should be remembered that the law of God dates from Mount Sinai and is as old as the eternal hills. The sixth commandment (in the Protestant catechism seventh) shall be just as binding one thousand years from this date as it was in the days of Moses. But were no command of God ever promulgated on this all-important matter, experience should suffice to teach all order and peace-loving communities the absolute necessity of establishing such a law as indissolubility. The Toronto Empire, whose opinion differs toto coelo from that entertained by the men in charge of the Free Press, says:

"The majority of the people are vehemently opposed to making divorce easy. They are the disastrous experience in this direction of other communities close at hand (the neighboring Republic), where the sanctity of the marriage tie has been trifled with so outrageously as to seriously sap one of the most vital principles of social order and stability."

THE NUN OF KENMARE ON FREEMASONRY.

The ex-Nun of Kenmare has taken advantage of the Mail's no-Popery proclivities to get some advertising gratis. She informs the world through the columns of that journal that she intends to deliver a lecture, during which she will produce a "Catechism" approved by the Pope and by Cardinal Gibbons in which Freemasonry is condemned in very strong terms. By producing the catechism she says she will make it impossible for Catholics to repudiate the "teaching of the Church" on this subject. Miss Cusack, the ex-Nun, acknowledges that no-Popery lectures in general misrepresent Catholic teaching most grossly, and that the public who attend such lectures are not usually satisfied unless this be done. She, however, declares that she will not follow this course, but will confine herself to telling the truth. She has not, so far, fallen exactly into the ways of Justin D. Fulton and Widdows, but neither has she, in her lectures, confined herself to truth; and we have no doubt that before long she will become as mendacious as any of the lecturers whose business she has adopted. She will find that her trade will not pay till she follow this