

PASTORAL

RIGHT REV. JOHN WALSH, BISHOP OF LONDON, ONT.

ON THE OCCASION OF THE DEATH OF POPE PIUS IX.

JOHN—by the Grace of God and the appointment of the Holy See, BISHOP OF LONDON.

To the Clergy, Religious Communities and Laidy of our Diocese, health and benediction.

DEARLY BELOVED BRETHREN,

The shadow of a great affliction has fallen on the Catholic world, and the whole household of the faith is filled with sorrow, for the great and good Pius IX. is no more. When the destroying angel passed over the land of Egypt he filled it with mourning and lamentation, because he struck down the first-born of many families; and so the angel of death, on Thursday, the 7th instant, filled the Catholic Church with grief and heartfelt sorrow, for he struck down the aged and venerable Pontiff who so long had labored for its welfare and prosperity. Yes, we have to deplore the death of Pius IX. who for nearly thirty-two eventful years guided with steady hand the bark of Peter over stormy seas and in the midst of raging tempests. Within this century death has claimed for its victims many illustrious men, famous in the arts of peace and war, and in the enjoyment of unlimited power; but amongst them all there was none who left such an impress on his time as did the Supreme Pontiff who has just passed to his eternal reward. True, he commanded no vast armies, nor did he bring fire and sword into once peaceful and happy homes, nor did he wade his way to power and glory through the blood of slaughtered thousands, but he wielded a power mightier far than that of armed hosts, and far more beneficent and far-reaching in its blessed influences. His conquests were in the regions of truth and morality, and were those of mercy charity and justice. From the watch-towers of Israel he looked out on the world committed to his pastoral charge, and with the sleepless vigilance and tender love of the good shepherd he guarded the flock of Christ from the ravenous wolves that came to steal, and to kill, and to destroy. By the timely condemnation of destructive errors, by the definition of great and fruitful truths, and by the magic power of his great example and of his splendid virtues, he has left an indelible stamp upon his age. Having traversed well-nigh a century of time, having served God in the Episcopate for more than fifty years, having ruled the Church of God as Christ's Vicar for more than the years of Peter, he rose serenely to his eternal repose like the Patriarchs of old, full of days and merits, leaving us all the priceless heritage of an unsullied name, of a holy life and of sublime virtues. He has sunk calmly to his rest, like the sun on a summer's eve, with not a cloud hovering over his bright and stainless memory. And now the majestic figure that for so long attracted the attention and excited the admiration of nations has disappeared. His place is vacant in the Vatican. The voice that proclaimed the truths of the Gospel to mankind is hushed, and the great heart that throbbed with Christian love for all, is still in death. But, in the language of Scripture, "he being dead yet speaketh." Pius the Ninth will live in history, will live in the annals of the undying Church, and will live also in the memory and affections of the millions of his devoted children.

To many it is incomprehensible why we Catholics take so profound an interest in the Roman Pontiff, whom most of us have never seen; why we turn to them with the docility and the confidence of children for direction in spiritual matters, for the solution of religious doubts, and for guidance in the difficult path that leads to eternal life. For us the reason of all this is perfectly natural and intelligible. The supremacy of the Roman Pontiff over the Catholic Church, in all that relates to faith and morals and jurisdiction, is an article of faith and a fundamental doctrine of our holy religion. What the sun is to the solar system, that the Sovereign Pontiff is to the Catholic system of belief. The Papacy is the rock on which the superstructure of Christ's Church rises in all the grandeur of its imposing majesty, in all the grace and beauty and harmony of its heavenly architecture. It is the unshaken foundation on which the Church securely reposes, proof against the tempest's shock and the upheavings of the earthquake. The Church of Christ is the kingdom of God on earth; it must therefore have a ruler. Every well regulated society must possess a Chief Magistrate to preserve it in law and order. Take him away and you reduce society to anarchy and chaos. We see this fact too well illustrated in the religious denominations that have adopted the radical principle of private judgment. They are split up into discordant fragments and jarring sects by the very force and action of the disintegrating and destructive principle which forms the shifting and sandy foundation on which they have sought to build.

The Church of Christ is a visible body; it must have a visible head. It is a shepherdfold; it must have a supreme shepherd to guard the sheep and the lambs of Christ's flock. In other words, the visible Church of Christ must have a visible ruler to act as Christ's Vicegerent, and to govern the Church in His name and by His authority until His second coming.

Even in the Jewish Church there was the office of the High Priest, who acted as God's Vicegerent, and was supreme ruler in spirituals. Now the Jewish Church was but the shadow of the Christian Church; the latter, the reality and the completion of the former, just as the many-turreted cathedral, with all its beauties and glories, is but the realization and completion of the grand inspired design sketched by the artist on his parchment. It follows, therefore, that in the Christian Church there must be an office answering to that of the High Priest in the old dispensation, and at the same time excelling it, as the new is the better and more perfect dispensation. Now, that office is evidently none other than that of the Sovereign Pontiff, the supreme visible head of the Catholic Church. In fact, even apart from the divine promises and appointment we find indications of the primacy and supremacy of St. Peter. In many pages of the new testament Peter is always named before the other Apostles. "The first, Simon, who is called Peter," says St. Matthew x. 2. He is the first that confessed his faith in the divinity of Christ, the first in the manifestation of love, the first of the Apostles who saw the risen Saviour, the first to whom the announcement of the resurrection was made by Mary Magdalen, as he was the first to bear witness to this stupendous fact before all the people. He was the first who gave directions when it was necessary to fill up the number of the Apostles, the first who confirmed the faith by a miracle, the first to convert the Jews, the first also to admit the Gentiles into the Christian Church, and it was he who presided over the Apostolic Council in Jerusalem. Of course, Jesus Christ is by personal and inherent right the High Priest, and Head of the Catholic Church, but the Pope is his Vicegerent and supreme visible head of the Church. Jesus Christ having transferred His glorified humanity from earth and placed it high above the whole hierarchy of heaven, even at the right hand of God, must rule the Church on earth by a substitute, and this substitute is Peter or the Pope acting as His vicegerent in His

name and by His sovereign authority, just as a King rules the distant provinces of his empire by viceroys. Our Queen never visited her Indian empire, yet she ruled there. She rules by a viceroy. Christ also when pleased to withdraw His visible presence from amongst us, rules His universal empire-church by a viceroy, and that is Peter and his lawful successors. There is no fact more thoroughly attested in the New Testament than this. Our Blessed Lord on a very striking occasion promised to St. Peter that He would build His Church on him, and that He would give him the keys of the kingdom of heaven as the symbol and evidence of His supreme power and jurisdiction in the Christian Church. He fulfilled these promises, as we shall see, before His ascension into heaven, by committing the whole flock, both the sheep and the lambs of the fold, to the pastoral care of Peter. In the 16th chapter of St. Matthew we find our Lord questioning His disciples and asking them "who do men say that I am?" When informed by them of the various opinions existing on this subject, Jesus said, "Who do you say that I am?" Simon Peter answered and said, "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God." And Jesus answering, said to him, "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona, because flesh and blood hath not revealed unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven. And I say to thee that thou art Peter, (that is a rock,) and on this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth it shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth it shall be loosed also in heaven." This is one of the most magnificent promises ever made to man, and the most far-reaching and beneficent in its influences. Peter is made the rock on which the Church of Christ is built. Peter is to the Christian Church what the foundation is to a house. Now, it is the foundation that gives strength, unity and durability to the house. If the foundation be sand-built, or if it be removed, the whole superstructure comes tumbling down into fragments; but if it be firm and strong and unshaken as a rock, then the rains may fall, and the winds blow and beat against the house, but it will defy the tempest and the floods. Peter being the foundation and rock-basis of the Church, imparts to it its enduring solidity, its order and unity, and its undying perpetuity. This authority must be the principle of its unity and strength. All the force of its laws must be derived from him, and all its authority must finally rest on him as its basis and groundwork. Who does not see that all this necessarily implies his primacy of order and jurisdiction and teaching over the universal Church?

Again, Christ gives to Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven, adding that "whatsoever he will bind on earth shall be bound also in heaven, and that whatsoever he will loose on earth shall be loosed also in heaven." With all nations the keys are a symbol of power and sovereign jurisdiction. When the Queen visits the cities of her kingdom, the keys are presented her in acknowledgment of her royalty and sovereignty. Without a fortress surrenders to a victorious general, its keys are presented to him to denote submission to his authority. So when Jesus promises Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven, He wishes thereby to convey the truth that He intends to impart to him supreme authority and jurisdiction over the Christian Church. This is the plain and evident meaning of the promise, or language has no meaning at all. It is the meaning attached to it by all antiquity, and by the living Church herself in all the ages of her existence. Nor is it a valid objection to say that Christ gave to all the Apostles on another occasion the power of binding and loosing, for, as Bossuet well says:

"When power is given to several, the exercise of the power by each one is restricted by the fact that others share it with him. But power given to a single individual over all, and without exception, necessarily implies the plenitude of power. . . . All the Apostles receive the same power, but not in the same degree, or with the same extent. Jesus Christ commences by the first, and in this first one. He develops the whole, in order that we learn that the ecclesiastical authority which was originally constituted in the person of one man is not imparted to others, except on the condition of remaining always subordinate to the principle from which its unity is derived, and that all those who shall be charged with its exercise are found to remain inseparably united to the same chair."

Our blessed Lord was now about to ascend into heaven to the glory of his father; but He will first redeem the promise of the primacy which He had made to St. Peter when he said He would appoint Him the rock of support of His Church, and would give him the keys of the kingdom of heaven. It was a most solemn and awful moment when Christ committed the care of his whole flock to Peter. He had shed His precious blood for the redemption of the world; He had risen glorious and immortal from the grave, triumphant over death and hell; He was now about to withdraw His visible presence from amongst men. But He will not leave us orphans. He will leave us a father, a vicegerent, who will rule the whole family of God in His absence, a supreme shepherd, who will feed and care for, and protect the sheep and the lambs of His fold. But before communicating this awful charge, before imparting this tremendous power, He exacts from Peter a confession of the most tender and ardent love. We find this solemn scene thus described in the 21st chapter of St. John's Gospel:

"When therefore they had dined, Jesus said to Simon Peter: Simon, son of John, lovest thou me more than these? He saith to him: Yes, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith to him: Feed my lambs."

"He saith to him again: Simon, son of John, lovest thou me? He saith to him: Yes, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith to him: Feed my lambs."

"He said to him the third time: Simon son of John, lovest thou me? Peter was grieved, because he had said to him the third time, Lovest thou me? And he said to him: Lord, thou knowest all things: thou knowest that I love thee. He said to him: Feed my sheep."—St. John, xxi. 15, 17.

In these words our Redeemer evidently, and beyond all power of cavil, appointed Peter supreme and concommunal pastor over His whole flock, with power to rule, govern and lead it, and with the right and the duty of shielding, protecting, and feeding it. In other words, Christ appoints Peter supreme pastor over the Universal Church; for the words, "my lambs, my sheep," comprise not only the faithful, but even the apostles, the bishops and priests, as belonging to the flock of Christ. Such is the doctrine taught by the Fathers both of the east and west. "To Peter," writes St. Epiphanius, "was committed the flock. He leads the way admirably in the power of his own Master." St. John Chrysostom, commenting on these words of St. John, speaks yet more strongly: "Why," he says, "passing by the rest, does He discourse with Peter concerning these things? He was the chosen one of the apostles, and the mouth of the disciples, and the head of the company." For this cause also did St. Paul take his journey to visit him in preference to the rest; and, withal, showing him he must have confidence for his denial has been done away with. Christ places in his hands the empire over the brethren. He appointed Peter, teacher, not only of the Church, but of the habitable globe.

The supremacy of Peter is the conviction and faith of all Christian antiquity. These prerogatives of supremacy and infallibility conferred on Peter must in the very nature of things descend to his successors. Peter is, by appointment of our Lord, the rock on which the Church is built, and its firmness

and stability depend on him. For the permanent good of the Church, and in order to preserve it safe from Satan's assaults, Peter is made its head and guardian. It follows, therefore, from these considerations, that for the security and well-being of the Church, Peter's sublime prerogatives should continue as long as the Church herself will exist; that is, till the consummation of the world. Peter's authority must therefore continue in his successors. Hence, the illustrious Bossuet truly says: "The prerogative conferred on Peter cannot be supposed to have ceased with him, because the foundations of a building designed to last forever cannot be subject to the ravages of time; therefore Peter will always live in his successor, and will always speak from his chair. Such is the Doctrine of the Holy Fathers, such is the declaration of the 630 Bishops assembled in the Council of Chalcedon. (Sermon on Unity.)"

(TO BE CONTINUED IN OUR NEXT.)

EDITH O'GORMAN EXPOSED.

THE CAREER OF A BROKLESS AND UNHAPPY WOMAN.

We regret to be called on once more to expose the sin and misery of even the God forsaken; but the evil they may do in their headlong course compels us to do so. We should prefer to leave the wretched woman Edith O'Gorman to her natural insignificance; but we have evidence of late that in several New England cities, she has caused bitter sectional animosities. In Milford, Mass., for instance where the selectmen, aware of her character, refused to allow her the use of the City Hall to "lecture" in a storm of wrath was raised, and many respectable persons, having faith in the unfortunate woman, denounced the selectmen as bigots opposed to "free speech." We are particularly sorry to see an intelligent and able-edited paper like the *Milford Journal* adopt the craze of the deceived ones, and proclaim that civil liberty, etc., was in danger; and publish resolutions declaring that "the unwarrantable interference with the freedom of speech, as manifested by the refusal of the selectmen of the use of Town Hall, for the lecture of Edith O'Gorman, merits and will receive the just indignation of every fair-minded citizen of Milford."

It is not the intention of the *Milford Journal* that "free speech" covers the license to utter malevolent falsehood and gross immorality—which we are assured the selectmen knew would be the matter of Edith O'Gorman's lecture. But without further preface, we take a glance at the personal career of this notorious woman.

EDITH O'GORMAN'S FIRST APPEARANCE IN PUBLIC.

Early in the spring of 1871, flaming show-bills announcing a lecture by "an escaped" nun, appeared in Madison, New Jersey. This was Edith O'Gorman's first performance. She made her debut before the scorn and ridicule of that city, with a story of convent horrors much more moderate, however, than her present fiery doses. A highly venerated priest named Darcy, beloved and honored for his many virtues by the whole community, had died a few months before her arrival. She knew that the least breath to the injury of his spotless character would arouse the violence of his numberless personal friends. With this conviction she devoted the greater part of her harangue to the aspersion of the fair fame of this dead priest. The body of the priest had been exposed before burial and publicly interred in the presence of hundreds among whom he had ministered. But the "escaped nun," whom the Evangelical papers then called very properly "another Luther," declared he was still living, and had fled from the country on account of crimes, which seemed endless in their repetition. The experiment was a success. The goal at which she arrived was won; she was transformed into a victim of religious persecution, and began to float on the wave of popularity.

HOW SHE ESCAPED FROM THE CONVENT

A few incidents of her career, immediately preceding her first appearance, will tend to show her character. We find her in a convent at Paterson, N. J., where her disedifying life nearly led to her expulsion. Through the kindness of the Superior she was spared the extreme punishment; but for her correction she was removed to the Orphan Asylum at Hoboken. Here she incurred the frequent displeasure of the Superiress and was often reprimanded. Her convent life, at last, came to an end in a manner keeping with her former course. She was detected late at night in one of the halls under suspicious circumstances. When discovered she pleaded somnambulism as an excuse. But this hypocrisy was not successful and Edith O'Gorman fled to avoid expulsion. As the *New York Sun* remarked on her first appearance as a lecturer—"She thought a convent a good and holy place till summoned by the 'Mother' to come to Madison, in order to explain the circumstances, when she fled to Philadelphia. After leaving the convent, she obtained money, in the name of the Superiress, from Sadtler & Co. (the Catholic publishers), of New York under false pretences. This certainly sustains her character as an honest woman." She alludes to this crime in one of the letters which she wrote, after her flight, to the Superiress, and which we append for the special pleasure of those who applauded this moral heroine.

HER REMORSE AFTER HER FLIGHT.

The remorse that prompted this woman to write the following letters must earn for her wretchedness a pity that will soften the condemnation for her sin. She craved for redemption to the home of purity she had sullied; but the guardians of that home knew her nature well, and they knew that they could not take her back amongst the spotless ones who peacefully followed the pathway they had chosen. She had not fortitude nor religion enough to bear her up against a refusal, but like a baffled wild animal, she dashes herself against the rock of innocence that had cast her off.

On May 9th, 1868 Edith O'Gorman wrote from Philadelphia to the Mother Superior as follows:—

HER FIRST LETTER TO THE MOTHER SUPERIOR.

DEAR MOTHER:—I humbly request of you to write to me before next Tuesday, whether I will be received or not. My money is nearly gone, and I have no work now; therefore, I shall be obliged to do something. I will not stay here. I will go to my brother and sister. Sister Juliana told me my sister Mary was to see me, and that you told her about me. As long as my friends know of my misfortune I will go to them, if you will not take me back, and I will try my best to make restitution. But, dear Mother, I will never again be happy. Oh, I hope and pray you will take me again into my only home where I can be saved. Please write to me, dear Mother, by Tuesday, and let me know my fate before my money is all gone. This I know you will do for Christ's sake, if not for mine.

I have well paid the penalty of my madness by all I have suffered. I have tried to recall to my mind whether I want Sadtler's as you said; I cannot remember it; Mother, still, I might have gone to him, for I was desperate and crazy. I remember nothing until I asked the girl I picked up to "show me where 'Turgis' lived." If I remembered going there, Mother, I would certainly tell you, because I am truly sincere, and would publicly confess all my sins before the whole community.

I have told you, as well as I can remember them all the particulars of my terrible misfortune. I don't know why I left for I never was unhappy in my holy vocation. I had no cause for going. If I was in my right mind I never would have gone in the manner I did. Oh, Mother, this is true. I can hardly realize what I have done. Sometimes I think it is a dream. I wish it were. I will suffer any mortification and humiliation if you will take me again on trial. My whole life will be one of the greatest humiliations, for I shall always know and feel that I shall never again be trusted. Write to me dear, dear Mother, and relieve me of the anxiety I am in, and may God help you always. I know you pity me, if you do not, place yourself in my position for a moment and see what misery I am in. Yours sincerely in Christ,

DE CHANTAL.

De Chantal was the name she assumed in religion.

EDITH'S SECOND LETTER TO THE MOTHER SUPERIOR.

Three weeks later, Edith O'Gorman wrote the following letter.

PHILADELPHIA, May 31st, 1868.

DEAR MOTHER:—After leaving Madison I went, as you directed to Father McQuaid. He said I will consider it, and you will hear my decision." I remained all night at the asylum. I told Sister Juliana my unfortunate story. On Saturday I will speak to Mother, and if anything can be done for you I will do it." I left Newark for Philadelphia in the half-past ten train; I did not go the Sisters in Newark.

Now, dear Mother, whilst I am writing this to you, I see you in the dear holy chapel (from which I am excluded in punishment of my sin), in your charity, praying the holy Christ to direct you what to do with the unfortunate prodigal who, in a moment of madness and despair, abandoned your kind care, and the holy peaceful retreat of my Heavenly Father's house, out of which I have never had a happy, peaceful moment. Yet "He that tilleth not the death of a sinner, but that he be converted and live," has, in His infinite mercy, inspired me to return again, and, like the prodigal, beg to be received as one of His hired servants, because I am no longer worthy to be called His child, much less His spouse. Yes, dear Mother, I am ready to undergo any humiliation or mortification that it may please Almighty God to inflict upon me, and will deem all too light to atone for my terrible sins.

I resign myself to the will of God, and will cheerfully accept whatever He ordains for me, whether I am received or not. If I am not received again into His household, I will strive to do penance in the world, and will make every endeavor to make restitution. Whereas, if it in His divine pleasure to receive me once more as His spouse, I will, by His holy grace, strive to edify more than I have desecrated. Mother, I am indeed sincere in this, else I never would have gone through the humiliation of seeing you, or the Bishop, and Father McQuaid.

With fear and trembling, yet with resignation, I await the decision upon which, perhaps, my salvation depends. Will you, Mother, please write to me the answer as soon as you have come to a conclusion? Sincerely, your most humble, sinful, yet repenting child, and sister in charity.

EDITH'S THIRD LETTER TO THE MOTHER SUPERIOR.

The next letter we have from Miss O'Gorman is as follows:—

EAST GREENWICH, JUNE 13th 1868.

DEAR MOTHER:—I left Philadelphia on Wednesday. I felt very uneasy and worried about my parents, so I thought I would see them, and thus relieve their minds of any uneasiness they might have on my account. I am thankful I did; for their hearts were broken with doubt in regard to my fate. I told them I was not in my right mind. I told the lady with whom I boarded that if any letter should come there for me to burn it.

Another reason why I could not remain there was, my money was nearly gone; I did not have enough to pay another week's board. Will you please write to me, dear Mother, and let me know what conclusion you have come to in regard to taking me back. I assure you, dear Mother, I can never be happy unless in religion. Thy, dear Mother, and do all you can for me, for my salvation depends upon it. You know I was not in my right mind when I left my happy home. I will devote my whole life to penance and humility. I cannot think of going to another community, because I feel I can only be unhappy there. If you receive me, I will, dear Mother, with God's holy grace, strive to atone by an humble life, for the scandal I have given.

Do not blame me, Mother, for coming home. I would never have come near my friends, only Sister Juliana told me my sister was there to see me. Take me back, Mother; if not for my soul's sake at least for God's sake. Pray for me, dear Mother, oh, pray fervently for your wretched, unfortunate child,

SISTER DE CHANTAL.

P. S.—Direct your letter to Miss Edith O'Gorman, East Greenwich, Rhode Island.

THE SISTERS REJECT HER—AND WHAT FOLLOWS.

No comparison need be made by us between these letters and the recent tirades of Edith O'Gorman in New England. We wonder not, that in a great city she would have many hearers; but we would wonder if, after having read these epistles, any respectable person or respectable journal could withhold decided condemnation of such a lecturer or such "lectures."

The above letters, appeared in the *N. Y. Sun* in 1871, which paper summarised her whole career as follows:—

From these letters, it will be seen that the story of Miss O'Gorman's wonderful escape from the nuns and priests was a sort of "Irish reticence"—that she was willing to submit to any humiliation in order to be taken back—that she even left Philadelphia after writing the first letter above quoted, and went to the Sisterhood at Madison, then to Father McQuaid, then to the Bishop himself, humiliating herself, and supplicating to be taken back. After being refused redemption into the Sisterhood, on account of what had transpired at Hoboken, Miss O'Gorman went down to Jersey City, and we next hear of her in an editor's office, where she was found by the editorial better half. The incensed wife of the editor handled her roughly, notwithstanding the editor declared she was only helping him to "read proof." Miss O'Gorman lectures in Paterson this evening, and is making money out of her vengeful campaign against a Sisterhood from which she has been excluded forever.

HER TRICKS TO MAKE CAPITAL.

It is not necessary to follow the devious career of a vulgar adventuress farther than the above; but it is just as well, once for all, to have done with "Miss" O'Gorman.

The *Boston Post* of January 8th, 1872, stated that at a lecture delivered by the "Escaped Nun" at the Boston Theatre, Madame Parepa Rosa, Mr. Sothorn, and Mr. Frank Mayo were present in one of the boxes, and that "Madame Parepa especially seemed to highly enjoy the lecture, judging from the hearty applause freely given." The following statement, which speaks for itself, was next day sent to the *Pilot*, by the business manager of the Boston Theatre:—

The paragraph in the *Pilot* concerning the "Escaped Nun" at the Boston Theatre was founded on an item which the versatile business manager of that deluded young woman furnished the *Pilot* with. I have told you, as well as I can remember them all the particulars of my terrible misfortune. I don't know why I left for I never was unhappy in my holy vocation. I had no cause for going. If I was in my right mind I never would have gone in the manner I did. Oh, Mother, this is true. I can hardly realize what I have done. Sometimes I think it is a dream. I wish it were. I will suffer any mortification and humiliation if you will take me again on trial. My whole life will be one of the greatest humiliations, for I shall always know and feel that I shall never again be trusted. Write to me dear, dear Mother, and relieve me of the anxiety I am in, and may God help you always. I know you pity me, if you do not, place yourself in my position for a moment and see what misery I am in. Yours sincerely in Christ,

Madame Parepa Rosa was induced by curiosity to learn whether Miss Edith O'Gorman was the same "Escaped Nun" that became an object of interest in a New York Hotel, by promenadeing the passages in her night-dresses; and although in a box with her husband, Madame R. was not visible to any of the audience. Mr. Sothorn, who was also mentioned, retired in disgust before the lecture was half over; and it is due him to mention that before the lecture began he expressed his opinion very strongly against the propriety of allowing such an exhibition as was announced. Mr. Frank Mayo speaks for himself elsewhere. The wrong done the artists named above was for the purpose of making capital and giving prestige to a palpable swindle."

Mr. Frank Mayo also wrote to the *Pilot*, declaring that the statement in the *Post* (furnished by Edith O'Gorman's agent, as see above) was an absolute falsehood. Mr. Mayo says:—"I did not occupy a seat in Madame Parepa's box, but in the rear of the theatre with two male companions, who, like myself, excited by mere curiosity, such as would attract us to listen to my sensational rubbish as much talked of, and so far was I from applauding, than the only impression left with me at its conclusion was that I had been listening to one who has more interest in the almighty dollar than in the Almighty God."

A STORY THAT EXPLAINS ITSELF.

From the Minneapolis (Minn.) News, republished in the *Pilot* May 4th. 1872.

"No man has a right to beat and maltreat any woman unless she is his wife. In some countries this is a proposition of the original law. In this country, although the practice is observed to some extent, we believe it is condemned by the statute in most States, and the usages of society. The little differences that arise in family life, can usually be settled without the resort to arms and blows; of course a man reserves his right when the statute allows it, of whipping his wife sometimes whether there be provocation or not.

"Without entering into any argument to ascertain upon what basis of legal or moral principles a man whipped his wife to-day, we propose to state upon the most reliable authority the following facts:

"Miss Edith O'Gorman is stopping at the Nicolet, room 49, although her name does not appear on the register. The register shows an entry on Tuesday last of the name of 'Prof. Auffray and wife,' which includes Miss O'Gorman, rooming as a boarder.

"Prof. Auffray is a large middle-aged man, with a fair complexion, beautiful black hair and moustache, and he wears a heavy cloak and silk hat. He has altogether a distinguished air about him, and one would suppose him to be either a railroad president or a senator. His rooms with Miss Edith, and is supposed to be her husband.

"Miss Edith is not allowed to come down to her meals nor to leave the room on any pretext, except to lecture at the Academy of Music. On one or two occasions tenants of the Nicolet, rooming in the vicinity of 49, have heard a disturbance in that room, and have been satisfied that somebody has been maltreated.

"To-day about noon these noises occurred again, and mingled with them were the screams of the woman, and blow after blow and entry after entry for mercy. The ladies attempted an entrance, but were denied, and the disturbance ceased. The brute Auffray was evidently engaged in beating Miss O'Gorman, whether upon provocation or not, makes no difference. There are various rumors afloat concerning the matter which we do not choose to print. The above, however, are facts upon which Auffray should be arrested.

"We should think with such treatment in domestic life, that Miss O'Gorman would infinitely prefer a convent with all its attendant horrors as she depicts them. We have no idea that these lines will ever reach her eyes."

AN UNPLEASANT EDITORIAL DUTY.

As we have said above, we would ever avoid heaping infamy on the humiliated, or exposing the depravity of the wicked. We would gladly refrain from this course with regard to Edith O'Gorman, but it is necessary to prove from her own bitter words that she was humiliated—deeply—as deeply as such a nature could be; and we know also, from the vile venom of her present course, that she is God-forsaken and reckless. She is advertised on the blank walls as "the beautiful and accomplished escaped nun." With her remorseful letters now before us, and with the knowledge of those flaming posters on the walls, what feeling can be entertained for the wretched woman hemmed in by her own truth and her lies, but one of the deepest compassion? We ask the *Milford Journal*, and other papers that have been deceived by this wretched woman, to publish these facts.—*Pilot*.

LORD O'HAGAN IN ENGLAND.

Lord O'Hagan presided at the twenty-fourth annual Catholic reunion, held in the Birmingham Hall to-night, in aid of the Catholic poor school of the town. In opening the proceedings his Lordship said he deemed it a high privilege and honour to be allowed to address so magnificent an assembly. He felt that, while he was personally a stranger to them, there were considerations which made him feel at home. He was an Irish Catholic, and as an Irish Catholic he addressed an audience assembled for good Catholic purposes. He did not believe there was any "runny" in the world, and certainly not England, that would receive as a stranger an Irish Catholic come to speak in advancement of Catholic interests and in assertion of Catholic rights. In England especially it could not be so, because all knew that between the Catholic people and the country to which he belonged, and those of this country there were great relations, and which had been since very ancient times. They would not forget that as far back as an early period of the Christian dispensation an Irish saint came into the wilds of Donegal to relate Christianity to the British isle from the storm-battered isle of Iona. They would not forget that, now, in later times, the Catholics of England and those of Ireland, had stood foot to foot and shoulder to shoulder in many a glorious and well fought field asserting their rights to civil and religious liberty. It was not too much for him to remind those who might belong to the religion, but not to the country to which he belonged, that by the aid of the Irish people the English people were able to assert the religious liberty of themselves and to accomplish their emancipation. He knew that the Catholic Church in England recognised crowds of worshippers in her temples who had in their veins the blood of Ireland. He knew that those who swarmed around her altar, rally in multitudes were Irishmen and women; and further, that among the priests, who ministered to the temporal consolations and eternal interests of the Catholics of this country, were not a few from the land to which he belonged. Therefore, feeling more or less at home at that meeting, he might say that there were many considerations which made him rejoice to be in Birmingham. He remembered that it had great town an illustrious man, the great Bishop Milner, ruled the Catholic Church, and was a fearless champion in the times of her deepest lowliness, when her mired head was bowed under religious persecutions; when God's worship was relegated to filthy and foul neighbourhoods. His Lordship referred to the progress Catholicism has made in Birmingham under the late bishop, to its continued advance under the late bishop's successor, the present Bishop Ullathorne.