

faith and love and tenderness of the Canadian and Irish people.

Take for instance the small shops where loving hands decorated the windows with garlands and lights, and statues of patron saints, and again householders in humblest walks of life, whose slender means admitted of no decorations, but who with stout new brooms turned out and swept away the dust and stray leaves from the pathway of the procession. Not only those, but the poor who, homeless, live in the institutions maintained by Catholic charity, could our separated brethren only know how they begged to be allowed to sweep or dust or decorate, or do some loving office, they would perhaps believe more in the living fact of the Catholics' faith. Then the men of high position, both socially and intellectually, who deem it an honour to walk in the ranks—the judges and physicians and merchants, who, throwing human respect to the winds, with doffed hat, make hearty profession of their faith—men, for instance, like the Honourable Edward Murphy, who yesterday bore the banner of St. Patrick's Total Abstinence Society in the procession with more pride than he would bear the flag of any earthly potentate. Surely life in Montreal is good for the soul.

I had intended to say a word of the imposing ceremonies which attended the laying of the foundation stone of St. Anthony's Church, on St. Antoine Street, but space will not permit. The new church will be a fine building both as regards the exterior and the interior though its pulpit will probably not attain the same degree of magnificence as that of the new Methodist conventicle, the pulpit whereof "is fitted with two handsome chairs and a sofa in garnet plush!" What next?

OLD MORTALITY.

Montreal, Feast of St. Jean Baptiste, 1889.

#### CORPUS CHRISTI PROCESSION IN MONTREAL.

It may be safely said that among the cities of the world Montreal stands unrivalled for the pomp and pageantry of its Corpus Christi celebration. No earthly conqueror was ever carried home in triumph like that which greets the God of the Host when borne every year in solemn procession through the streets of the privileged city. Nobody that saw the double line yesterday, reaching in unbroken continuity through the whole route and the thronged sidewalks that flanked it, would say it was external show or sentimental display and not rather the loyalty of the heart's deepest convictions struggling for fit expression, that set the procession in motion.

Yesterday's celebration was unprecedented in point of number, splendour and magnificence. At early morn the thickening heavens wore a menacing aspect, but when the *gros-bourdon* of Notre Dame rang out the procession summons the clouds, as if in obedience to the signal, melted away in a brilliant firmament. Forthwith the sun poured down a flood of unclouded glory on arches and drapery, banners and costumes, on the snow white surplices and glittering vestments. Under the rich gilt canopy the Sacred Host in golden monstrance was borne by His Grace the Archbishop. The organization was perfect and order reigned with the stillness of prayer and adoration. Few sights could be more impressive than the sea of faces looking out from the Place d'Armes and foreground of the large church on the returning cortege or the immense congregation within, filling floors and galleries as the societies filed down before the illuminated altar.

One of the distinguishing features of this year's solemnity was the conspicuous part taken in it by the English-speaking population. Not only did their various parochial societies and confraternities swell the ranks, but prominent professional and business men—bankers, brokers, insurance agents—walked with uncovered head the whole length of the procession. The smile of unbelief or subdued sneer in the face of many a bystander suddenly gave way to a serious, inquiring gaze as the eye turned from the long lines of the women and children to the ranks of intelligent men who filled positions of influence and trust in every walk of daily life.

Two reasons may be assigned for this unusual zeal on the part of the English-speaking Catholic body to take active part

in this great demonstration of faith and religion. The first is the series of so-called Anti-Jesuit, but really anti-Catholic, meetings by which a bigoted sectarian minority led by the Ministerial Association and backed by the fanaticism of a neighbouring province has attacked the most fundamental dogmas of the Catholic majority and heaped insult after insult on its most cherished institutions. The patience hitherto shown by the leading Catholic citizens and their desire to avert a religious war have prompted them to show all the more strongly by this great demonstration of faith their unflinching determination not to yield one inch of their rights or suffer any intermeddling in their internal religious affairs from any outside body. Yesterday before the public act of faith of a whole city the reptile agitators slunk into their hiding recesses among benches comparatively empty.

Another cause of the multiplied numbers that took part in yesterday's demonstration is the stimulus given to faith and piety by a more thorough parochial organization in the shape of Leagues, Rosary Societies, Holy Family Associations, etc., in some one or other of which scarcely a woman or child in the city is not enrolled with no inconsiderable number of men. These societies and the devotions which they propagate have a direct tendency to warm faith and provide for it a fitting expression in the pomp of religious ceremonial. May they long continue the good work begun and give proof of it each succeeding year in a celebration as full, enthusiastic and magnificent as yesterday's.

J. J.

#### CLOSE OF THE PERCIVAL-EGAN CONTROVERSY.

Sir,—In his letter of the 30th ult., Rev. Mr. Percival promised to prove that the Catholic Church was opposed to the circulation of the Bible. Since then, however, he has made two important discoveries, which preclude for him in future the possibility of his having anything more to do with me. The first discovery is that I am not a gentleman, and secondly, he has suddenly conceived most exalted sentiments of self-respect. It is indeed a great loss to him that he did not much sooner make those, or some other discovery that would give him a reasonable excuse before the public to decline entering on a polemical controversy. It is a pity his self-respect did not come to his aid before he commenced to make false statements, now known to be such, before he commenced to falsify authorities, and commit literary forgeries, of which he has been plainly and duly convicted.

In the beginning of our correspondence I gave him some good advice, but not believing, perhaps, that I meant to be friendly towards him, he, like a wayward boy, did not mind, and the result is that he has fallen repeatedly into the pits which he dug out for himself. I warned him against second-hand quotations, and he would not mind. I advised him, in regard to his public lectures, to select subjects about which he knew something, and he will have reason for many a day to bewail in the bitterness of his heart, that he did not take my advice. It is an old saying that children should not play with edged tools. It is very dangerous amusement for children, because they do not realize the danger of such tools. Theology is a dangerous thing for some people to play with, and especially for those who know nothing about it. We have had recently a striking illustration of this truth in Richmond Hill.

I am told that some people are very much displeased that this controversy should have taken place: they feign to be scandalized that clergy should quarrel after this fashion. While Mr. Percival was drawing large crowds to his church, slandering and misrepresenting Catholics, it was all right, but when the tables began to turn, and his frauds were exposed, those Christian people began to discover that such controversies are uncharitable, and do not make conversions either way. In other words, Mr. Percival should have had his own way.

I now ask any candid reader, has he proved one of his statements, or met one of my arguments? The controversy arose because I called upon him to prove his statement that the Church teaches that the end justifies the means. Has he proved that? I leave the public to judge. He charges me with raising side issues, but I ask, who introduced the Scott Act, the Bible, relics, bones, mental restriction, &c. &c.? and