

The Catholic Record.

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

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTGRAVE, Editor.

REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY, Author of "Mistake of Modern Ireland."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor.

Agents for Alexandria, Glenora and Leaside, Mr. Donald A. McDonald.

Agents for advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion.

Approved by the Archbishop of Toronto, and recommended by the Archbishops of St. Boniface, Ottawa, Kingston, and the Bishops of Hamilton and Peterboro, and leading Catholic Clergy men 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.

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

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

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., Oct. 11th, 1890

SALVATION ONLY IN THE TRUE CHURCH.

Quebec, Sept. 20, 1890.

To the Editor of the Catholic Record, London:

Although a Protestant, I am, as you are aware, a subscriber to your excellent paper. And I now desire you to settle a point of discussion between two friends. Is it permissible for a Catholic priest to say Mass for the repose of a Protestant's soul? And if so, is it not strangely inconsistent, inasmuch as, outside of the Catholic Church there is, in your opinion, no salvation? If such a Mass is allowed, it cannot but be a solemn mockery.

Yours truly,
READER.

In reply to our esteemed correspondent, we have to state that it is allowable for a priest to celebrate private Mass for the repose of the soul of a Protestant deceased; for, even though he do not appear to be within the pale of the Church, we ordinarily make no pretence of judging his ulterior dispositions, even through life. Much less can we say that such a one has died impenitent, for we cannot know what has passed between God and the soul, or how earnestly contrite that soul may have been during the last moments while it was in the body. St. Augustine says in his work on "Care for the Dead": "It is better to abound in those things which will neither hurt nor profit than to lack in those which will be of benefit." Further, as our Lord says of the Sabbath that it was made for man, not man for the Sabbath; so the sacraments of the Church and the Eucharistic sacrifice are instituted for the benefit when there is a reasonable hope that they will be profitable to him. For disciplinary reasons, however, Masses are not offered up with public solemnities for those who died notoriously in sin, nor for those who died notoriously in the profession of heresy.

Our correspondent asks us whether we are not inconsistent in offering Mass thus for one who is outside of the Catholic Church, and for whom, therefore, there is no salvation.

It will be seen from our answer that we do not always judge the interior from outward appearance, and this would be a sufficient answer to his query. However, we imagine he would wish us to be somewhat explicit as to the doctrine of the Church with regard to exclusive salvation within her pale. Our correspondent is evidently in error regarding this point, and we shall endeavor to give him some light upon it, though briefly.

1st. All wilful and grievous acts of disobedience to the commands of Almighty God are mortal sins, which exclude from the kingdom of Heaven. But it must be remarked that in every definition of sin, as given by Catholic theologians, wilfulness is expressed. That the act of the will, which arises from freedom of choice, is necessary either to merit or demerit, is clear from many passages of Holy Writ; but we shall quote only the following:

"God made man from the beginning and left him in the hand of his own counsel. . . . Before man is life and death, good and evil: that which he shall choose shall be his." (Ecc. xv. 14, 15.)
"I have set before you life and death, blessing and cursing. Choose, therefore, life, that both thou and thy seed may live." (Deut. xxx. 19.)

"Because I called, and you refused; I stretched out my hand, and there was none that regarded." (Prov. i. 24.)

2. Among God's commandments, it is very positively stated that we must hear His Church, receive His Apostles, and believe His teaching, for he that believeth not shall be condemned. (St. Matt. xviii. 17; x. 14, 15; xxviii. 20; St. Mark xvi. 16.)

It follows that those who are wilfully outside the Church of God are guilty of grievous sin, and are outside the pale of salvation. We say wilfully, because all sin must be wilful. But those who are outside through want of knowing better are wilfully outside if they do not make use of the means of knowing their duty which are within their reach. Hence it is only those who are invincibly ignorant of the true religion who can be excused, even on the plea of ignorance. Those

who are invincibly ignorant are not excused thereby.

We do not pretend to decide how many are in this condition of unlawful or of wilful ignorance of what they should do. But certain it is that all should make proper use of the means within their reach to know the true religion; and if they neglect those means of knowledge, they are truly culpable for remaining outside the Catholic Church, which alone is the Church to which Christ committed the authority to teach all nations. All other Churches are confessedly of human origin. History tells us how men attempted to improve the one Church which God established to teach His truth forever.

Those Christians who desire to know the truth, and who make use of the means within their reach to know it, are properly included by the Church within her pale, if they are otherwise virtuous. They are said to belong to the soul of the Church, even though to all outward appearance they are Protestants, or called by any other name. We do not affirm the number of such to be either great or small. God knows them. But our correspondent, "Reader," will see that there is no inconsistency in our admitting that in some special case there is a possibility of a certain individual being of the number, even though he be called a Protestant; and this is why there is no difficulty nor mockery in offering up for such a one the great sacrifice of the New Law.

THE POPE AS ARBITRATOR.

A statement was recently sent by cable that the Pope had expressed a willingness to arbitrate between France and England on the subject of French claims in Newfoundland if both countries would accept his arbitration. While it is perfectly true that the Holy Father would be an excellent arbitrator, whose decision would be just, and most likely satisfactory to both countries, it is very improbable that he has made any such offer, as it does not appear that either nation has asked him to arbitrate. There can be little doubt that the despatch is one of those foundationless sensational rumors which the concoctors of the despatches send to the associated press from time to time, when the Holy Father or the Catholic Church is in question.

That many of these rumors are without any foundation in fact, we have constantly abundant evidence. Some very recent instances of this have occurred. A late despatch stated that the Franciscans had been expelled from Jerusalem by order of the Sultan. This was found to be a positive untruth. The Very Rev. Father Vesin, the Franciscan who occupies in the United States the position of Commissary of the Holy Land, received from the Superior of the order in Rome a telegram which denies the statement as entirely false. The Sultan protects the Christians of the Empire, notwithstanding that minor officials are frequently guilty of siding with the Mohammedan mobs who are always ready for pillage and murder. The relations which exist between the Holy See and the Turkish Government are quite friendly and the Catholics have important privileges throughout the Empire.

Another instance of false news concerning the Pope was the report that three Archbishops, namely, Archbishop Walsh of Dublin, Archbishop Eyre of Edinburgh, and Archbishop Keirick of St. Louis, besides Mgr. Stonor, were appointed to the Cardinals.

No doubt is thrown upon the merits of these distinguished prelates, yet it is now perfectly well known that the statement was altogether premature. We have no hesitation in saying that the supposed offer of the Pope to arbitrate on the Newfoundland difficulty is equally premature. This being the case, it is a piece of wanton impertinence for the Atheistical and anti-Catholic press to sneer at the Holy Father in connection with the matter, as some have been doing. They ridicule him, that, having lost his temporal power, he should presume to act as a peacemaker among nations.

It is true, as they say, that the Pope's temporal authority has passed away, for the present at least, but it does not require that he should be the ruler of a vast empire in order to give a just decision in matters of dispute between powerful monarchs. The Popes have always been the protectors of national liberty, they have been opposed to tyranny and oppression, and have judged the actions of kings, equally with those of private individuals, according to the standard of God's law. Who, then, could be more fit to arbitrate between nations, if it be advisable that there should be such an arbitrator recognized instead of appealing to the sword, as is now the custom? Would it not be more in accordance with the principles of Christian charity if some such arbitrator were chosen? And if so, there is no one whose authority in Christian morals is so universally acknowledged as the Pope. There is, therefore, no absurdity in supposing that he might be recognized in that capacity as he was recognized in

Europe from the 11th to the 14th centuries.

It was not, however, from motives of ambition, but from a sense of duty that the Supreme Pontiffs during the middle ages occupied such a position in the midst of a Catholic community of nations. But though circumstances have so changed that they occupy it no longer, it does not follow that it would be disadvantageous to the world if they were so recognized now. In fact, but recently the Protestant Government of Germany and the Catholic one of Spain found it to their advantage to make Pope Leo XIII. their arbitrator, and he was cordially thanked by both for his just decision. England and France might do well to ask for a similar favor, not only on the Newfoundland question, but whenever a difference grows up between them. But the favor would be to the governments interested, and not to the Pope.

It may not be likely that the disputes between these countries will be settled in this way, but the high authority of the Pope, and the noble character, especially of the present occupant of the chair of St. Peter, are not fit subjects for the sneers of an Atheistical or Irreligious press.

ORANGEISM IN BOSTON.

Under the presidency of Mrs. Margaret L. Shepard, who is described as an escaped nun, a meeting was held in Boston on the 25th of September, at which it was almost unanimously decided that there shall not be erected in Boston any memorial to the late John Boyle O'Reilly. Mrs. Shepard is a hogan nun, and notwithstanding the bigotry which exists in Boston, and which was made manifest in the action taken by the majority in the city on the school question, but a small audience assembled in Tremont Temple for the purpose of accepting Mrs. Shepard's dictum to the citizens of Boston as to what should be done on the question of erecting the memorial to the respected patriot, poet, editor, and Christian whom all America is at this moment proposing to honor, independently of race or creed.

The pseudo nun had an audience for the most part consisting of Orangemen and women from Ireland and Canada, and, of course, it was out of the question that such an audience should recognize any merit in a deceased Irish Catholic, who has been once under the ban of the English Government on account of his patriotic feelings for his native land. There is no stigma attached to the name of John Boyle O'Reilly. He was sent into exile as a convict solely because he loved his country, and such an exile, such an imprisonment, far from degrading, adds lustre to his name. The people of America recognize him, and they will erect to his memory a worthy monument in Boston, the place of his abode, and the people of Boston will protect the work.

The meeting in Tremont Temple was intended to prevent the intonation of the American people from being carried into effect. But the "escaped nun" overreached herself by the absurd manner in which she carried out the proceedings of the evening. Four reporters were present, representing some Boston journals, the *Globe*, *Record*, *Herald*, and *Courier*. The representative of the *Herald* was a lady. The escaped nun took occasion to tell the press reporters that they did not know their duty, and called upon them several times to take special note of remarks she made; but especially when she said:

"I want the people of Boston to understand that we will not allow any memorial to O'Reilly to be put up in this city."

She had said in Lynn some weeks previously, before an audience similar to the one she addressed in Boston, that if such a memorial were erected in Boston, "if there are not enough loyal men to pull it down, loyal women will do it."

The reporters were so indignant at the implied insults of the presiding genius of the meeting that, to use their own language, they "formed a homeward procession to resent the insults offered to them."

The Boston *Record* says of the gathering that "it was held under the auspices of the 'Loyal Women of American Liberty,' supplemented by the 'Loyal Orange Associates,' the British American Association, the Loyal Men of America, and the United Order of American Mechanics." With the exception of the last-mentioned society, there is certainly a ring in the titles reminding us very much of the "Loyal Orangemen" of Canada, and it appears, from the accounts of the meeting which have reached us, that the Canadian Orangemen, resident in Boston, were the originators of the whole affair.

The Governor of Massachusetts had been invited to the meeting, and also the Mayor of the city, Mr. Hart, but both declined to be present. The Boston *Record* says of it:

"The warmest friends of the Catholic element in Boston could not ask anything better calculated to help that religious body than such rancor as has lately been displayed."

The Boston press are almost unanimous in condemning the spirit of bigotry which was made manifest on the occa-

sion of Mrs. Shepard's meeting, and this gives reasonable hope for the future of the wave of fanaticism which has been recently enveloping the city has passed over it entirely, and that the bigotry which was instrumental recently in electing an anti-Catholic School Board has been at least partially dissipated. The Boston *Globe* says, in an editorial article:

"That any persons in Boston should be found to oppose a popular expression of popular love for a man like O'Reilly is a sign of pettiness, of narrowness, of provincialism, that the people of Boston will resent. Boston ought, by this time, to be large enough to see and love and honor any fluency or grandeur of manhood, whatever that race type that provided it, or the creed that colored it. We pity the 'loyalty' that cannot see that 'man' is a larger word than 'America.'"

The blasing of the names of the Governor of the State and of the Mayor of Boston by those present at Mrs. Shepard's meeting has particularly angered the Americans, and there is a strong determination in the city to see that Mr. O'Reilly's memory shall be duly honored.

THE TOBACCO QUESTION.

From the letter of Mr. O'Brien Atkinson, which appeared in last week's issue of the *Record*, it might be inferred that we both defended and advocated the use of tobacco in any form. We merely stated facts, and facts are stubborn things. There are many little comforts, sedatives and harmless luxuries that might be dispensed with as well as tobacco. The Germans, Italians, the French and Spaniards, manage to live and get along very well without tea. Why could not we in England, Canada and the United States give up the use of tea, which, taken in excess, inebriates, enfeebles, brings on hysteria and other miseries? The money spent on tea alone would build up not only houses and towns, but canals and railways. Enormous sums of money are also spent on wines, on lager beer, on dainties and fads of every kind that are not of absolute necessity. It takes all kinds of things and people to make up a world. But neither the Catholic *Record* nor the Catholic Church believes in extremes. Our esteemed friend and kind correspondent did not seize the drift of our argument when we joyously criticized the Methodist General Conference for wasting so much valuable time over tobacco, which might have been more usefully spent in explaining the Apostles' Creed or enforcing the Ten Commandments. The Catholic Church will accept no lessons of purity or of liberal reforms from Methodism, nor will she ever join the fanatics in their about for total prohibition by civil law. The *Record* will be ever found within the lines of Catholic teaching, and our respected friend need not fear that under such guidance faith or morals shall suffer danger of defection or dissolution.

THE CHURCH IN FRANCE.

A cable despatch states that Cardinal Lavigerie has been entrusted by President Carnot with a message to the Pope promising concessions to the Catholics on condition that they abandon their hostility to the Republic. There is certainly great reason to doubt the truth of such a statement, for President Carnot ought to know, if he does not, that Catholics are not opposed to a Republic as such. But it is to be expected that they will oppose with all the energy they can command the acts of any Government, be it Republican or Monarchical, which refuses to the Church that liberty which belongs to her by divine right. Let the Atheistical Government of France cease to persecute the Church by offensive legislation; let them cease to oppress French citizens because they belong to religious orders; let them not deprive the Catholics of the country of the liberty of educating their children in the truths of Christianity—and they will find that none are more devoted to the interests of country than those who are loyal to their religion.

If the despatch be true, it would show that the present Atheistical Government know that they have no hold upon the affections of the French people, and that as soon as the people generally realize sufficiently the impotence of taking part in the elections, and thus having a vote in the government of the country, Atheistic rule will come to an end. It took years of Atheistic rule in Belgium before all people were roused to assert themselves, and to insist upon being governed in accordance with their wishes, and France appears to be in the same position. It may be many years yet before the inexorable spathy will be shaken off which seems to lie as an incubus upon the French people. At present they are ruled by the most noisy and most ungovernable class in a few of the large cities, and though it is well known that the population generally are thoroughly Catholic at heart, the Atheists are allowed to have their own way.

There have been, however, recently, evidences that the real sentiment of the country is making itself felt. The defeat of the Government not long ago on the question of the exemption of clerical students from military duty is one of

these evidences, and another is to be found in the fact that the exclusion of the Sisters from the hospitals of Paris has excited general indignation. Even the irreligious people of the cities have given expression to their sentiments that the loss of the maternal vigilance with which the good Sisters cared for the unfortunate inmates of these institutions is a public misfortune, and this general feeling has been echoed with singular unanimity by the physicians of the city.

President Carnot need not have any fear that Catholics will oppose the Republic if the Republic do justice to the Church. The Catholic religion is not attached to any particular form of Government, but the Church will always insist that its liberty to rule itself in purely ecclesiastical matters shall be recognized, whatever may be the form of Government.

MORE RANT.

An anti-Ritualistic young lady of Hungerford, England, has succeeded in making herself about as ridiculous as the Ottawa anti-Ritualists who seceded from St. George's Church because the *Kyrie eleison* was sung therein. Of course all Christianity comes from the Catholic Church, and in this sense the introduction of the *Kyrie eleison* (Lord have mercy on us) was an evidence of tendency towards Romanizing the Anglican service. Beyond this, we do not see where the Ritualism came in in the Ottawa case, any more than was the case at Hungerford. The English papers state that the rector, Rev. Mr. Watkins, through fear of catching cold, wore his academic cap while conducting a funeral service. We do not know that an academic cap is anything more Ritualistic than the *Kyrie eleison*, but there is certainly nothing in the Anglican rubrics to prevent its use. However, the daughter of the deceased was exceedingly angry at the sight, and twice interrupted the service, demanding that Mr. Watkins should remove his offensive head gear.

Mr. Watkins could not see any reasonableness in the demand of the disconsolate young lady, whom he did not regard as having even the authority of an Act of Parliament to make Church rubrics for his use, and he firmly, but in a very kind manner, refused to comply with her request. Hereupon we are told:

"The young lady interrupted the crematorium, declaring she would not have her father buried like that. He was a Protestant, and so was she, and he should be buried accordingly. As the clergyman continued the service, she threw down a wreath that she carried and left the church-yard."

She was a Protestant indeed! and, therefore, she was not satisfied to have her father buried in a Protestant cemetery, by a Protestant rector, and according to the ceremony prescribed in a Protestant Common Book of Prayer! Her father must be buried in accordance with the Ritual which her Protestant notions might invent, just as the Ottawa dissidents wished to dictate a Ritual for St. George's Church. The Hungerford young lady carried a wreath. We wonder if some fastidious people might not have discovered Ritualism in that!

And, by the by, what will the Orangemen say to this discovery that academic caps are Ritualistic? They wear these very Papistical articles at their oracles every Byzantine-water day. But, probably, they are made anti-Papistical by the hideous change they have made in their color.

THE MAIL'S FRENCH CRAZE.

The Mail is very much troubled about a visit paid to New York by Mr. Mercier in company with several prominent gentlemen of the Province of Quebec. The Comte de Paris reached New York soon after the Quebec gentleman, and the Mail, or at least its "own correspondent" in Montreal, seems to be very much troubled lest the purpose of Mr. Mercier's visit be to make arrangements for handling over the Province of Quebec to France. As the Comte is not on the very best of terms with the existing French government it may be presumed the transfer will not take place, at all events until the Comte becomes King of France. When will that be? The Mail's correspondent is sure of one thing, however, that the visit of the Quebec visitors is "very mysterious."

We suppose that the Comte will be invited to visit Quebec, where he will be the guest of the Government, and all this is surely very menacing to loyal Ontario. The Emperor William and the Shah may visit England, and no one fears that the British Empire will fall under their sway, but Mr. Mercier is to be suspected of high treason should he presume to show some courtesy to one who is believed to entertain some aspirations still for the throne of France. To speak seriously, however, we sincerely hope that should the Comte visit Canada he will be hospitably entertained, and especially so in Quebec, where he will meet with a population of his own race, and we may say kindred, notwithstanding that they are under another flag. Respectful courtesies rendered even to a scion of a deposed dynasty cannot surely do any harm; but should the Comte ever attain the object of his ambi-

tion, he will be none the worse disposed either towards Canada or Great Britain for having been courteously received on the occasion of his visit. We may add, however, that there is as yet no evidence except rumor that Mr. Mercier's object is that which the Mail's correspondent attributes to him. The correspondent adds that some of the Conservative papers are making fun of Mr. Mercier in connection with the matter. No doubt they are; but as long as the people of his province sustain him at the polls so decisively as they did at the recent election their fun will be of rather a leguabrous character. They can laugh best who win. Every one can see that the source of the Mail's splenetic comments is its irrepressible desire to misrepresent everything which takes place in Quebec. Hostility to French Canadians is the mainspring of its whole policy.

A NEW CHRISTIAN UNION SCHEME.

The sect known as "Disciples of Christ," and which met in convocation in Owen Sound last June, appointed a committee of five to prepare for publication a paper on Christian Union from the Disciples' standpoint, and the result of their deliberation was made public in Saturday's *Globe*. They are favorable to union, but they declare that it cannot be brought about either by a federation of different sects, as some want, or on a theological basis, as wished by others. They would insist, as the first condition of union, on the abolition of creeds, resting solely on a profession of faith in the Bible. They declare that the sole doctrine of the early Church was the divinity of Christ, and that this should be the only doctrinal test required for Church membership. The committee appear not to be aware of the fact that there are sects which profess to draw their belief from the Bible, but which nevertheless deny Christ's divinity. Such are the Unitarians and Universalists, who have large congregations in Toronto and elsewhere. And yet after laying down the very broad platform of the abolition of creeds, they lay it down as necessary that the new Union Church shall practice baptism by immersion, which they declare to be "an essential element of the unity of the Spirit."

It is not likely that these new proposals will lead to any practical results, but they make clear what we have always pointed out, that a union of Protestant sects can take place only by an agreement to ignore doctrines which are at present held to be divinely revealed; and the more extensive the union the more complete must be the elimination of doctrinal teaching from the newly invented Christianity.

It cannot be denied that Christ sent His Apostles to teach all that He taught and that St. Paul pronounced an anathema against any, even though an angel from heaven, who would preach any other gospel than that which he had preached. This new Christianity is clearly a different gospel from that originally given to the saints, and it is only by submission to the authority of the one Church which Christ instituted that there can be that unity which will preserve true believers from being carried away with every wind of doctrine.

We might well ask the five committee-men who sign the Disciples' manifesto, on what principle do they require a profession of belief in the Bible, if, as they say, Christ's divinity was the only doctrine of the Church which primitive Christians were asked to believe?

BAILOUR'S BARBAROUS ACTS.

In fertility of resource for goading the Irish people to the frenzy of despair and consequent lawlessness Mr. Balfour far surpasses all his predecessors in the Irish secretarship. Mr. Forster earned an unenviable reputation for himself by loading with buckshot the policemen's fire-arms and ordering assaults with baton and bayonet to be made on young girls and boys who shouted after the landlords and the emergency men. In Disraeli's time the Talbot informers made pretence of piety to lure away in secret societies the unsuspecting youth of the country, and then betray them to the Government. Talbot, who was an Orangeman, came from Dublin to Tipperary and professed himself a fervent Catholic. This occurred during the Fenian excitement of 1866. Talbot had any amount of money to spend among the boys. He was the loudest in condemning the Government of England and appealing to an armed revolt. He pretended to go to confession and made sacrilegious communions to still further ingratiate himself into the confidence of his intended victims. Talbot acknowledged all this on oath before judge and jury in Clonmel. His dupes were honest, God-fearing Catholics boys, who were to believe that through their means Ireland would soon be free from foreign rule. On the testimony of the arch-fiend Talbot they were condemned to imprisonment for life in the dungeons at

Spike Island or consigned to a wretched existence worse than death in the penal colonies.

Now we have it on the sworn testimony of Balfour's jury that he entered privately into the sacristy and there listened to the confessions of the penitents, who, in the sacred tribunal of penance, sought reconciliation with God, for the despatches cabled last Saturday from Tipperary, where John Dillon and William O'Brien are on their trial for conspiracy, state that "a policeman swore in his evidence that he followed several of the defendants into the vestry of the Catholic church and tried to overhear what was said by them to the priest who was hearing confessions." It is further stated that this testimony aroused the indignation of counsel for the defendants, and he demanded to know if the penal days had returned, when the sanctity of the confessional could be invaded. Balfour should have lived in the days of Titus Oates and the gunpowder plot. He cannot truly be set down as a representative man of enlightened England. It is true Father Garnet and two other Jesuit Fathers were executed in penal times because they would not divulge what was made known to them in the secrecy of the confessional, but such barbarisms and wanton cruelty belonged to the Elizabethan era, and would not be tolerated now in any part of the civilized world. Balfour, however, has no regard for the sacrilegious divulging of sacramental trust and confidence. He would, if possible, share with God Almighty in the secrets of men's hearts, and then punish without mercy the unsuspecting penitent. But an end must come, and very soon, to this unmanly and insufferable tyranny that calls up the memory of Blue Beard and his hanging victims. John Morley, since his return from Tipperary, where he was nearly bludgeoned to death, is cloaked with Mr. Gladstone at Hawarden and both are following closely the barbarous antics of Balfour and his maliced myrmidons, stealing on tip toe to hear the peoples' confessions and making themselves the laughing-stock of the civilized world.

AMERICAN CRITICISM OF BALFOURISM.

The following from the New York Times is a fair sample of what Americans think of Mr. Balfour's attempt to ruin Ireland's cause by arresting the Irish leaders:

"The more the Irish arrests are considered, the more difficult it becomes to assign any motive for them, that is both intelligible and respectable. That which was assigned in our Dublin dispatches is neither. The reflection was quite obvious that, if the arrests were intended to defeat the visit of O'Brien and Dillon to this country to collect money for their cause from Irish-Americans, what it did defeat was its own purpose, since it is quite certain that nothing could more surely open the purses of Irish-Americans than arrests that seem so wanton. Moreover, Mr. O'Brien himself, in an interview, expresses his disbelief that this was the purpose of the Government. It is his opinion that the arrests were made in order to terrify in advance the tenants whom the Government means later to evict for withholding their rent in furtherance of the Plan of Campaign. Doubtless such a general eviction could be managed, although it would require a very large force and be attended with great expense. But what good would it do? Nobody would venture to take the holdings from which the previous tenants had been evicted for following the Plan of Campaign to which the whole Irish people are committed. It tenants were found who agreed to pay the rent the evicted tenants were unable to pay, they could not pay it. Meanwhile they would be harried with 'outrages' which the whole British Army, if it were stationed in Ireland for the purpose, would be unable to prevent or to punish. The landlords who receive nothing now would receive nothing then, and all Ireland would be in a turmoil that would render impossible the continuance of its regular and productive industries.

"There is really no doubt that the rent which the tenants threaten to refuse to agree to pay is more than they can pay and live. This is not a question of race or of sentiment, but purely and simply of economics. If the present tenants were evicted all over the island and the highest bidders for their holdings put in their places, the existing situation would be presented again in less than a twelve-month. The competitive rent and the farmer's living cannot both be made from the land. The Plan of Campaign is the natural result of these conditions. Where the tenants have tendered so much of the rent as they can afford to pay there is no fault to be found with their conduct except, of course, with the national impudence that induced them to offer more than they could pay. What they have offered as much as they could afford is a question of fact, which, under the principle established by Mr. Gladstone's Land Bill, might properly be referred to tribunals created for that purpose. At any rate, eviction is no remedy for the distress of the landlords, and the only result it seems perfectly certain to bring about is a multiplication of outrages."

A new Polish church was dedicated in Philadelphia by Archbishop Ryan which will be one of the finest churches of the city. It cost \$100,000. The corner stone of the Church of the Nativity was laid on the same day, ten thousand persons being present at each of the ceremonies.