

refers to the withholding of Home Rule from Ireland as the only blot on British statesmanship the same gentleman who withheld Home Rule from our sister provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan and gave them a nice touch of Home Rule instead when he allowed the fine Italian hand of Mgr. Sbarretti to stab to the heart the best principles of provincial rights, sever the first cord in the British North America Act and in the presence of our Premier and his acolytes break off the handle and leave his knife in the wound, thus adding another foul stain to the many dark spots on the escutcheon of Liberalism under the Laurier regime. This newspaper, published by gentlemen for gentlemen considers it a violation of provincial rights that Catholic children should be permitted in school hours to be taught their obligations to the God Who made them. Here is another nugget in the paper published by gentlemen for gentlemen: "This disgraceful deed was the sequence of the Jesuitical trick of '96 engineered by a Spaniard, one Morry del Val, when the Church sprung the school question on what our province chooses to call the Postage Stamp Province." But the worst is to come. In this paper, published by gentlemen for gentlemen, appears the following:

"The first grandiose of Jesuitical intrigue in Canada was evidenced on the night of the election 'ever since,' and driven home when Tarte and the Hon. John Costigan, Minister of Inland Revenue in the Conservative Cabinet, representative of the Irish Roman Catholics, and mover general of Home Rule resolutions, bolted for the Grit camp, where they, like Judas, received their reward, and a little later, when the Bishop of Baltimore referred to Sir Wilfrid as a dear friend of the Church, and last, but not least, at the great religious show in Montreal, where he proclaimed amid acclamations his ardent and steadfast adherence to the host and the elevation thereof, and according to evidence adduced at the different departmental investigations, the bulk of his followers are just as ardent worshippers of the dough."

(Italics are ours.) Our worthy Governor General lately drew attention to the bad manners of the children hereabouts. He did not include Quebec. Commenting on this pronouncement a writer in the Toronto Star recently said, amongst other things:

"If you meet a boy on the road in this Province and ask him where Mr. Spulpin lives, he says, 'Eh? What do you want to see him about?' And when you have satisfied him on that point he will want to know if it's Old Spulpin you're after. A man past thirty is always 'Old Smith' or 'Old Robinson,' as the case may be. Meet a boy of the same age in Quebec and he will volunteer to go with you and leave you with the house in sight."

Evidently in the management of The Toronto Mail and Empire may be found the grown-up—the development—of the boys referred to by the Governor General, graduates of the little red school house where God is ignored and the dollar worshipped. It is a thousand pities that we have in the press of Canada reckless writers who do not a little to create and foster a depraved public sentiment. This vulgar and blasphemous reading matter in the Mail and Empire makes one ask: whether are we drifting? When we see in some of our papers printed thoughts which would bring shame to the cheek of the average bootblack—well, as the politicians would say, it is time for a change. It is a pity that the Mail and Empire management, as becoming gentlemen who pretend to publish a paper for gentlemen, do not copy the style of the Toronto Globe, a paper characterized by broad-mindedness and elegance of expression. We hope no one will accuse us of political proclivities in this matter. Let the light between Tory and Grit—the fight upon questions of public policy—be fought upon their merits, but let us have civil, judicial argument in chaste English. In this respect the Globe is a model. The Mail and Empire, published by gentlemen for gentlemen, the reverse.

#### A WAR IN WORDS ONLY

A press despatch tells us that there are fifty thousand Orangemen in Ulster and the other counties of the North of Ireland who will resist Home Rule by force of arms. Are we to take this as another sample of yellow journalism? If there is any foundation whatever for the rumor it gives us still another proof of the semi-insanity of the rank and file of the Orange Order and the criminality of the Grand Masters. As an excuse for this turbulent spirit on the part of the Williamites it is stated that their civil and religious liberties would be placed in jeopardy were Ireland's local affairs administered by a Parliament in Dublin which would naturally contain a majority of Catholics. Past and present conditions in Ireland abundantly prove that such a claim is put forward by Unionist politicians for selfish purposes. The facts are altogether against the contention that Protestants would be unjustly dealt with under the new conditions. We find in Ulster a fierce bigotry and injustice practised by the Orange element against their Catholic fellow citizens; while in the South of Ireland, in counties almost exclusively Catholic, the small Protestant population is treated

with the utmost liberality and kindness. Any Protestant who has ever lived in the South of Ireland will acknowledge this to be the case. May we not take it that this outbreak amongst our Orange friends is one of their periodical exhibitions of bad temper. They are the apostles of civil and religious liberty—for themselves. For Catholics they are bent to deal it out in homoeopathic doses. If turbulence comes in the north when Home Rule is established the "rebellion" of our Orange friends would be short lived. To the county of Tipperary alone the War Department might assign the duty of putting down the little unpleasantness. The men in that county could settle the matter in about a week. It might be, however, that the Canadian Orangemen might show a disposition to take part in the fracas. But, alas! such action has already been forestalled. The Canadian navy, commanded by that "Jesuit," Laurier, would take up a position at Quebec, and Colonel Hughes, who would have to order his yellow brigade to beat a retreat.

#### A SPLENDID WORK

Toronto leads the van in the matter of debating societies, a work which means a great deal for the future of many a young man. We are getting beyond the period when golden hours were wasted in shuffling little bits of cardboard. There may be justification for a card social once in a great while, but the bulk of our leisure time should be devoted to exercises that will leave something healthy and valuable in the memory.

Some days ago the first debate of the Toronto Debating Union was held. It was a great encouragement to all who were present—a goodly number—some three hundred of the best Catholic men, young and old, of the city. A correspondent informs us that it was a delight to see so many interested in the debate.

We congratulate the priests and Christian Brothers of Toronto upon the satisfactory outcome of their efforts to promote and extend this admirable object and before long we hope that other centres will establish like organizations. In this case a trial of literary capacity might be held between clubs visiting one another. Eventually it might be found feasible to establish a Provincial Debating Union, with branches in Ottawa, Kingston, Toronto, Hamilton and London. This would be to our mind a commendable work. All honor be to those who are engaged in this admirable undertaking.

#### ARCHDEACON ARMITAGE ON ANGLICANISM

To the Editor: You have done me the honour in more than one issue of "your paper to refer to my lecture: Did Henry VIII. found the Church of England?" and to the newspaper correspondents arising from the lecture. In the closing issue for the year 1910, you state that you believe that the Canadian editor is as a rule a fair-minded man, and that he does not wish his paper to be a "propagation of prejudice." I presume that you place yourself in this category, and your journal as well. I therefore ask for room in the Record for the discussion of the subject, and the spirit of fair-play in any controversy which may arise therefrom.

First, I wish to state that my reference to the calumny of the Jesuits, that the Church of England dates only from the Reformation, is far from being a malicious attack upon that order, but merely a simple, plain and indisputable statement of fact. If I wished to attack the Jesuits, I have plenty of ammunition ready at hand, and most of it from the very arsenals of Romanism the statements of its own Popes, Bishops, priests and people. I turn the Papal guns upon the Jesuits, I wish to say that one may well admire the self-sacrifice of the members of the Order, and yet detect and abhor the system to which they belong. The Jesuit order is a very large and powerful organization with many solidities of men and women, directly influencing a membership of some twenty-five million people. It would be passing strange if it did not produce some devoted and earnest men full of the spirit of self-sacrifice.

What has the Papacy itself to say of the work of the Jesuits? Pope Clement XIV. was one of the ablest and best of the Popes. He suppressed the "Society of Jesus" altogether, by a Bull dated July 21st, 1773. He stated that the kings of France, Portugal and Sicily had been compelled to expel the Order, to prevent Christians from rising against one another, "and from massing one another in the very bosom of our common mother, the Holy Church." The Pontiff declared that the Jesuits had produced "dangerous seditions, tumults, discords, dissensions, scandals, which weakening or entirely breaking the bonds of Christian charity, had excited the faithful to all the rage of party, hatreds and enmities. Pope Benedict XIV. denounced the Jesuits as "disobedient, contumacious, captious, and repulsive persons."

Mr. Frank Hugh O'Donnell, a well-informed Roman Catholic and a representative Irishman, claims that they have ruined education in Ireland, that they were the cause of the French Revolution, and of French infidelity, that "Voltaire, Diderot, D'Alembert, Helvetius, and Robespierre were the pupils of clerical schools, and mostly of Jesuits."

So much for the testimony of Romanists. Now for more independent testi-

mony, the Jesuits formed what they thought would be a model state in Paraguay. There they had their own way, used their own methods, and were completely in possession, without a rival of any kind. They were the soul masters in spiritual and temporal. What was the result? Let Mr. Washburn, an unbiased witness, tell us his experience on the spot, as United States Minister at Asuncion, tell us. It was, says Mr. Washburn, "the worst government ever devised by the perverted ingenuity, selfishness, and avarice of man. The Indians under it were abject slaves." And again, speaking of the Indians on the frontiers in their missions: "They were in great prison pens, with Holy Fathers for overseers." (See History of Paraguay). The only further comment necessary is that of Webster in his article in the Encyclopedia Britannica: "Marriage has fallen so completely out of fashion that only three per cent. of the births are legitimate."

I leave your readers to judge how mild my statement was when you charge me with a "malicious attack."

You ask me as editor some fair questions which I will proceed to answer. The first: "Since there is not so much growth of error as so easily traced we regret that the Archdeacon did not trace it for us," it gives me pleasure to throw light upon the subject. The Catholic Record, if given in detail, will be content I presume with a skeleton sketch, and some illustrations, but if not I hold myself ready to give you the fullest particulars.

Take as an instance the claim of Papal Supremacy, that the Pope is the divinely constituted Monarch of the Christian Church. There is not so much as a trace of it in the New Testament, or in the Primitive Church. Pope Gregory I. (A. D. 590) declared that even the term "Universal Bishop" was an unchristian assumption, and that whoever allowed such a name to be applied to him was a profane, arrogant, blasphemous, superstitious, haughty transgressor of the law of the gospel, an apostate from Christianity, and worse than anti-Christ. (Authorities: Gregory's Letters to Sabinius, Eulogius, Anastasius and Cyrillus.) Yet this monstrous claim of Papal Supremacy grew until Pope Nicholas I. (A. D. 860) claimed the Papal Monarchy and it reached its height in the days of Innocent III, 1198, who made the blasphemous claim that he was the "vice-regent of Christ," a term the full significance of which can only be understood in Milton's noble lines:

"But whom send I to judge them? When but their Viceroyers' Son." The Reformation shook the foundations of the Papal Supremacy. Its historians showed that it was based upon the most impudent and outrageous forgeries. Notation of the fact that the Reformation grew up as a result of the sad complaint of Pope Pius IX. that there was not now a Christian nation in Europe, a country which would carry out the Papacy to carry out its claims, and an aspersions upon modern Christianity.

As an instance of the growth of error the doctrine of Transubstantiation is one of the most glaring. It is opposed to revelation and to reason. It is founded upon a false and exploded system of philosophy (Realism) which no thinking man would accept. It rests simply upon Papal authority.

The theory of Transubstantiation was first invented in 831, promulgated in 1215, and formulated in 1562. Its real originator was Paschasius Radbert, a monk of Corbie in the ninth century. Paschasius has many novel and strange speculations, notably his view that the Lord Jesus Christ was without an original sin, and that the Virgin's womb, and his strange fancy that the consecrated elements in the Sacrament are not digested. His theory of the supposed change in the Sacrament during Transubstantiation is opposed both to the Word of God, and man's God-given reason.

A third instance of the growth of error is the institution of the Mass, that the sixth and seventh centuries, until sanctioned by the Pseudo Council of Nicea in 787, and finally acknowledged by the Council of Trent in the sixteenth century.

A fourth instance is the use of images, a breach of the second commandment, but sanctioned in 787. Charlemagne in his Caroline books repudiated the system, and the Council of Frankfurt, but the Popes were in favour of it, and fastened it on the Papal system, contrary to all Scripture, and to such Fathers as Augustine who said: "It is utterly unlawful to erect any such image of God in a Christian Church" (Ep. de Fide Sym. c. 7); and of Lactantius who declared: "There is no doubt there is no religion where there is no image" (Divin. Inst. c. 18).

Perhaps the doctrine of Purgatory will suffice your appetite for facts at this time. True it is a large subject with many ramifications, touching as it does the question of Indulgences and the practice of Masses for the dead. It has no sanction in Holy Scripture. It was unknown in the Primitive Church. It grew out of some foolish dialogues of the Middle Ages, and it is impossible that he was the author of anything quite so puerile. It developed from the dreams of the poor martyred Perpetua (if the acts of her martyrdom are not fictions). It received official sanction from the Council of Trent in 1563, but it has only reached its full bloom in modern times.

The second direct question you ask me to answer is: "How did the pretended usurpations arise?" The position of influence exercised by the Bishops of Rome was quite natural at the first, and for that matter quite proper. The Bishop of Rome was a brother among equals, but a rich brother, a powerful brother, and in the early days as a rule a generous and kindly disposed brother. Rome was the centre of civilization when men were coming from and going to all parts of the world. It was perfectly natural that the Bishop of Rome should have tremendous influence and power. It was not until the fifth century that the name Pope emerges as the distinctive title of the Bishop of Rome. It is still

the official title of the Archbishop of Alexandria. For that matter every Greek priest is called Pope. Divest it of its Roman character, and it is one of the most harmless of words, in matter of fact only a baby-word Papa. Innocent I. (A. D. 402-17) was the first to dream of Rome's universal supremacy. Leo the Great (410-61) was the first to grasp at power. The next stage is illuminating to a degree, the transfer in 476 of the seat of empire from Rome to Constantinople. This left the Pope as the greatest figure in Rome and consequently in the West. Another striking feature was the overthrow of civil institutions by the invasions of the Barbarians, which led to the addition of power to the Church, the Pope and the Bishops. Then came the elaborate forgeries known as the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals (A. D. 850-900), which gave the Pope a number of supreme monarchs of the Church, and influencing in the dark days of ignorance almost all western Europe. The famous Hildebrand, marks the next great advance, for he attempted like a second Alexander to make himself absolute Master and Monarch of the world. He was the author of this monstrous claim was reached by Pope Boniface VIII. in 1302, who declared that a two-headed Church would be a monstrosity, that the sword of the information required, and I furnish by permission of the Pontiff. It is a far cry to the days when these claims could be made good amongst civilized nations, but the Papacy has not been able to stop at one or two of the claims themselves, but rather reinforced them by the Vatican Council of 1870. Thus I do two things in this statement, I furnish the information required, and I give a succinct account of the growth of one particular error in the Church of Rome.

You have many hard things to say, Mr. Editor, of Henry VIII. and his part in the English Reformation. The kind of argument is unworthy of your columns in the twentieth century. Your own historian Barrow tells us of Popes who were far worse than the worst that has ever been said of Henry. It is strange that Roman controversialists do not stop to think that there must be another side to the argument. If the proceedings in connection with the divorce of Catherine of Aragon were disgraceful to Henry, they were disgraceful to the Pope. The facts are these: Henry's elder brother Arthur was married to Catharine. Arthur died, and Henry VIII. was crowned King. He was a Catholic, and to gain the Emperor's goodwill in one act. Henry VII. applied to Pope Julius II. for a dispensation to allow his son Henry to marry his deceased brother's widow. The Pope granted the dispensation against the protest of Warham, Abp. of Canterbury that it was contrary to divine law as set forth in Leviticus XVIII. Henry was only a boy twelve when the betrothal took place on account of the urgency of Ferdinand. He carried out his father's wish, he married Catharine against his own conscience, for he was trained in the Church and intended for the Primacy, but the Scripture warning: "If a man shall take his brother's wife, they shall be childless" (Lev. xx. 21) seemed to be literally fulfilled for the child was born dead, or died immediately. (See Lingard iv. 200; Hall: State Papers) The King in his own words said: "I doubt the punishment of God in that behalf." Henry was troubled by "a scrupulous conscience." He was driven to "consider the estate of this realm," and to "despair of any issue male by her." (Cavendish, p. 220.) All this was before he had married Catharine. He was seduced by Gardiner, known to history as "wily Winchester," the champion of Rome, who burned people at the stake for denying Transubstantiation, but who would not consent to the divorce. He was the work of his own hands: "True Obedience," in which he denounced Henry's marriage with Catharine as incestuous, and impugned the Papal supremacy. Pope Clement VII. pronounced Henry a divorce, as Henry himself declared in his letter to the Pontiff: "according to your promises, but we have been so often deceived by your promises that we have no dependence can be placed upon them." The Pope told Francis I., King of France, that the king of England was right, that his cause was good, that he had only to acknowledge the Pope's jurisdiction, and he would give him a formal act, to find sentence immediately pronounced in his favor. (Letter of King of France, Legation, vol. 3.) There was no question of the Pope's mind. The whole question hung on statecraft, whether it would pay better to alienate the English King or the Emperor. There were presidents plentiful enough of the English royal family. Henry's own sister Mary was the third wife of Louis XII. of France. When left a widow, she married Charles Brandon, duke of Suffolk, made famous in "When Knights Shook in Flowers." Brandon had married a cousin by dispensation, but pleaded that the dispensation was invalid, because he had previously made a contract of marriage with a lady who was his wife's cousin, and because his grandmother was a sister to the father of a former husband of his wife. The marriage was declared null. Henry had another sister Margaret of Scotland, who married James IV. of Scotland, and who secured a divorce from the second, the Earl of Angus on grounds far more absurd, based on pure fictions, but decided in Italy after two years deliberation. (See State Papers Vol. iv. p. 491.) Whatever blame is to be assigned to Henry, much more is due to the Papal Curia, which as Creighton, one of the greatest of modern historians, has so ably shown, was not anything was possible. (Papal Modern History). But there is worse to follow. Clement the Pope gave his legates a special commission, declaring the marriage of Catharine and Henry null and void, and gave instructions that under certain circumstances it was to be burned. The legates against the marriage of Catharine and Henry, and when the Pope heard this he was very angry and said: "They can do

as they please provided they do not make me responsible." The last act in the drama is equally illuminating. The final decision was reached by an Ecclesiastical Court, composed of Bishops in full communion with Rome, who decided, as the learning of Europe had already decided, that the Pope did not possess dispensing power, that as there had been no marriage no divorce was necessary, and that the King was free to marry again.

Now as to your aspersions upon the King's Supremacy. Your position is as disloyal as it is unhistorical and unscriptural. People of British blood have through all the centuries been impatient of an appeal to a foreign power whether it be Prince or Pope, or both under the same name as the claim made by the Pope to be above the sovereigns of the earth in temporal as well as spiritual. The Reformation took us back to the primitive practice, as witnesses Scripture and the Fathers, that the Sovereign is "Supreme Governor" of the Church in all causes as well over all persons in all causes as well ecclesiastical as temporal. (See 56th Canon.) We hold unwaveringly that the King's Majesty hath the same authority in causes ecclesiastical as godly kings had amongst the Jews, and Christian Emperors in the Primitive Church. (Canon 2)

All your jibes and sneers at the Anglican Church, Mr. Editor, fall of themselves like spent bullets. They have been disproved so often, that as a rule we pay no attention to them. If your readers can thrive on such an intellectual pabulum of wretched husks of false history, of appeals to prejudice, of constant shafts of calumny against the Church of England, (a pure branch of the Holy Catholic Church at once Apostolic, Evangelical, Catholic and Protestant) we are sorry for them.

The Anglican Church is as old if not older than the Church of Rome. It possesses a purer faith for it is based entirely on the Word of God. It enjoys a purer Liturgy the most spiritual and scriptural in Christendom. Its teaching is Evangelical: "The Faith once for all delivered to the saints." Its practices are Catholic based upon the teachings of the Primitive Church. Its principles are conservative of every good and liberal with charity towards all. It was founded not by a "royal lecher" (if I

may soil this paper with your own words which border on the indecent) but by Apostolic men. Its supreme head is not of earth, no boy-king as you sneeringly say, (I do not stop to ask you about Boy-Popes) but Jesus Christ, Head over all blessed forever. It is not a sect as the Church of Rome in England is, a schismatic body which went out of the Church of England in 1570, its present episcopate being an Italian mission created by Pius IX. in 1870. The Church of England, in the words of Gladstone is the same Church that existed from the beginning. There was no new Church in the reign of Henry VIII. The same clergy, nearly 13,000, remained in the Church, and officiated in its services during the reign of Queen Elizabeth, as had ministered under Queen Mary. Cardinal Allen is our witness that only 250 refused the oath, and separated themselves from us, because they were not of us. The reforming of the Church from abuses, the cleansing it from error, the establishing of it in justice did not break its continuity. It is the same body, just as Parliament is the same organization though rejecting in a larger measure of liberty.

The Church of Rome curses us, constantly pours the vials of her wrath upon us, stands ready to rob us of our priceless possessions of a free and open Bible, a Scriptural Ministry, a valid Sacrament as Christ commanded, and above all of our blood-bought liberties. The Church of England has nothing but charity towards all, and offers her prayers daily for all who profess and call themselves Christians. It is in the spirit she inculcates that I offer my fervent wish, that your readers may know the truth, and that the truth may make them free. Yours etc.

W. J. ARMITAGE.  
Halifax, N. S.

The people naturally like a sunny disposition—it is the hallmark of a good conscience and a patent of honesty. Some people act as though they had been bathed in crab juice in infancy, spooned up on bitterness and whey in their youth, and in their adolescence nurtured on a mixed diet of wormwood and gall.

#### CONVERTS OF A YEAR

INTERESTING FACTS ABOUT SOME LATELY RECEIVED INTO THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

By Scannell O'Neill

The past year was a fairly good one in the way of conversions. I don't remember a year in which we have had such large confirmation classes of converts. For instance, in the archdiocese of Philadelphia, which seems to be a haven for converts, in the month of May, more than three hundred converts were confirmed. This is indeed a wonderful record for one diocese, and speaks eloquently for the zeal of the clergy there. Of course the other dioceses of the country can show nothing approaching this record for one month; but from what I have learned, I should be disposed to the number of persons confirmed last year at three thousand. I think it would be a very good idea to have given in every instance the exact number of converts confirmed. Such a custom, if faithfully followed, would add greatly to the value of our statistics.

THE RECORD IN ENGLAND

England seems to have left us in the lurch this year as regards distinguished converts,—consequent on the reception of the two Brighton Vicars,—their clergy, and a portion of their flocks. These devoted men have had to bear the brunt of the usual attacks made upon men who leave the Anglican Church in obedience to conscience. At such a time your advanced Anglican is not a bit above making common cause with the most rabid Exeter Hall rafter, in the presence of their common foe—Rome. In this connection it is painful to see a man like Father Maxwell, S. S. J. E., preaching in St. Bartholomew's church a sermon which he must have known was most unfair to the former clergy and the Catholic Church. This exhibition only goes to show to what lengths religious rancor will drive even good and earnest men.

From the letters of an English friend, I learn that about one hundred communicants of the Brighton churches have been received into the Church. Some of the converts were received

CONTINUED ON PAGE EIGHT

## Midwinter Sale

OF

## Used Organs

This Midwinter Organ Sale is "special" in every sense of the word—special in the extraordinary high character of the Organs offered—special in the wide choice of styles and makes to select from, and special in the unusually low prices asked.

Never before has there been a better bargain offering—perhaps never again will you have so excellent an opportunity to buy the very Organ you want and buy it right.

**Terms of Sale** { Organs under \$50, \$5 cash and \$3 per month, without interest.  
Organs over \$50, \$10 cash and \$4 per month, without interest.  
A discount of 10 per cent. for cash. Each safely packed without extra charge. A handsome stool accompanies each instrument.  
IN ORDERING, better send your second and third choices, in case the first should be sold before your order is received.

- Thomas**—5 octave parlor organ by the Thomas Organ Co., in solid walnut case with small extended top. Has 6 stops, 2 complete sets of reeds, knee swell. **Sale Price \$33**
- Karn**—5 octave parlor organ by D. W. Karn & Co., Woodstock, in solid walnut case with decorative design with high top. Has 12 stops, 2 complete sets of reeds, knee swells, etc. A fine organ. **Sale Price \$44**
- Bell**—5 octave parlor organ by W. Bell & Co., Guelph, in handsome solid walnut case with bevel edged mirror top. Has 10 stops, 2 sets of reeds in treble, one set in bass, mouseproof pedals, knee swells. A handsome, modern organ. **Sale Price \$47**
- Domination**—A specially handsome parlor organ by the Domination Organ Co., in solid walnut case with bevel edged mirror top. Has 10 stops, 2 complete sets of reeds, patent folding mouseproof pedal cover. A modern instrument in perfect order. **Sale Price \$49**
- Uxbridge**—6 octave parlor organ by the Uxbridge Organ Co., in solid walnut case with extended top. Has 11 stops, 2 sets of reeds in treble, 1 set in the bass, couplers, knee swells, etc. **Sale Price \$51**
- Domination**—5 octave chapel style organ by the Domination Organ Co., in solid walnut case with panelled and finished back. Has 11 stops, 3 sets of reeds in treble, 2 sets with an extra sub bass set in the bass, knee swells, etc. **Sale Price \$59**
- Uxbridge**—6 octave piano case organ by the Uxbridge Organ Co., in walnut case. This organ is made without stops, designed to look as much as possible like a piano. Has 2 complete sets of reeds. **Sale Price \$63**
- Bell**—5 octave organ by W. Bell & Co., Guelph, in handsome solid walnut case with pipe top. Has 14 stops, 4 sets of reeds in treble, 3 sets with an extra sub bass in the bass, knee swells, mouseproof pedals, etc. **Sale Price \$63**
- Doherty**—6 octave piano case organ by the Doherty Organ Co., in walnut case. This organ is made without stops, designed to look as much as possible like a piano. Has 2 complete sets of reeds. **Sale Price \$67**
- Domination**—6 octave piano case organ by the Domination Organ Co., in handsome mahogany case. Has 11 stops, 2 complete sets of reeds, patent folding mouseproof pedal cover. A modern and handsome instrument. **Sale Price \$69**
- Uxbridge**—6 octave piano case organ by the Uxbridge Organ Co., in walnut case, handsome by decorated and of attractive design. Has 11 stops, 2 complete sets of reeds, knee swells, etc. **Sale Price \$71**
- Karn**—6 octave piano case organ by D. W. Karn & Co., Woodstock, in handsome mahogany case with mirror rail top. Has 11 stops, 2 complete sets of reeds, couplers, knee swells, mouseproof pedals, etc. A fine organ. **Sale Price \$73**
- Domination**—A very handsome Chapel organ by the Domination Organ Co., in solid walnut case with finished back. Has 17 stops, 4 sets of reeds in the treble, 3 sets in addition to sub bass in the bass. Has lamp stands, automatic folding mouseproof pedal cover. **Sale Price \$77**
- Bell**—5 octave organ by W. Bell & Co., Guelph, in handsome solid walnut case with particularly attractive pipe top. This is a large, finely built organ, with 17 stops, 6 sets of reeds in the treble, 3 sets and sub bass set in bass, knee swells, mouseproof pedals, etc. **Sale Price \$79**
- Domination**—6 octave piano case organ by the Domination Organ Co., in handsome mahogany case with mirror rail top. Has 12 stops, 3 sets of reeds in treble and 2 in bass, knee swells, mouseproof pedals, etc. A fine organ. **Sale Price \$81**
- Karn**—6 octave piano case organ by D. W. Karn & Co., in specially handsome case with mirror rail top, modern in design and in perfect order. Has 11 stops, 2 complete sets of reeds, couplers and Vox Humana, knee swells, mouseproof pedals, etc. This organ has been used a very short time. **Sale Price \$89**
- Estey**—6 octave piano case organ by the Estey Co., Brattleboro, Vt. This organ is a splendid sample of this celebrated make. Is in solid walnut case with carved panels, lamp stands and mirror top. Has 11 stops, 2 sets of reeds throughout, 2 couplers, 2 knee swells. Used less than a year. **Sale Price \$102**

**Gourlay, Winter & Leeming**  
188 Yonge St. Toronto, Ont.