The Catholic Mecorb cablished, Weekly at 486 Richmond Street, London, Ontario. REV. JOHN F. COFFEY, M.A., Editor. THOS. COFFEY, Publisher a Proprietor.

General Agents:

Messrs. Donat Crowe and Luke King.

Ottawa Agency:
P. J. Coffey, Gen'l Agent, 74 George St.

RATES PER ANNUM.—One Copy. \$2.00;

three Copies, \$5.25; Five Copies, \$7.50; Ten
copies, \$12.50. Payable in every case in vance. Advertising rates made known on appli-

Advertising rates made known on application
Approved by the Bishop of London, and recommended by the Bishops of Ottawa, Kingston, and Peterboro, and leading Catholic Clergymen throughout the Dominion.
All correspondence addressed to the Publisher will receive prompt attention.
Arrears 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, SATURDAY, NOV. 22, 1884.

THE CRISIS IN ENGLAND.

Mr. Gladstone has won another of his old-time triumphs. The second reading of the Franchise Bill was carried in the Commons by a majority of 372 to 242. and the third reading agreed to without a division. This is, to our mind, an echo of the popular indignation at the course pursued by the peers in last session, refusing to assent to the same measure after it had by such triumphant majorities passed the popular chamber. The Marquis of Salisbury last session took ground on this subject quite indefensible. In his speech on the bill he asked the House to remember that there was no opposition to an extension of the franchise, the question being how political power was to be distributed so that the interests of all classes of electors should be protected. He regarded as very important the statements of Lord Derby and the Lord Chancellor, that they would not attach much importance to the circumstance of a general election occurring before the passing of a measure of redistribution. If that was the feeling of the Government it might be expected that their followers would not be in much hurry to carry a Redistrithe point of procedure, he asked whether the demagogues, of whom they had heard so much, would draw any distinction between destroying the bill by resolution and destroying it by proposing in committee an amendment which, elsewhere, the Government had announced their intention not to accept. The question was whether the promise of the Government to bring in a Redistribution bill was a sufficient security. Nobody doubted the sincerity of the assurances given their lordships on that point; but for the last four years the Government had not been able to keep their promises. And, even supposing they succeeded in keeping their promise to bring in a Redistribution bill, would they engage free hand in modifying that measure. ing with Redistribution. The fact was, that if the Government the part of the Government which the action of the Conservatives in the Comagreed to put in the bill before their lordships a clause providing that it should not mons had amply vindicated." come into operation until a Redistribution bill was passed, the matter would be settled. If they did not, the responsi- blunder this session. Their perverse bility of the rejection of the bill would obstinacy last session aroused throughout rest on them. After a humorous com- the country the bitterest feelings of indigmentary on some of the speeches in nation. Mr. Bright voiced the honest support of the bill, the noble lord observed sentiments of the masses, when, addressing that expressions of indignation out of 20,000 of his constituents at Birmingham, doors could be produced to order. If a he declared : certain number of persons chose to assem- "The Tory majority in the House of ble and take wholesome exercise in Hyde Park, their doing so would be no indication of the feeling of the constituencies. The Opposition was charged with wanting to bring about a dissolution. Apart from this question, they had no wish to do so, for in a party sense things were going on charmingly for them; but in reference to this question, not only prudence, but justice, required that the people should be consulted. If there were an appeal to the people, the Opposition

In other words, he professed himself friendly to the measure, but wanted to have it accompanied by a redistribution bill. Why? Because he wished to secure the rejection of both, or at best their mutilation to such an extent as to eliminate the principle of representation according to population. Neither he nor his fellow peers have any real desire to ance to existing institutions." see popular privileges extended. Neither he nor any one among his lordly associates desires such a redistribution of Parliamentary seats as will accord with the genius of free institutions. Hence his cunning but rather clumsy refusal to accept the assurance of the government that the Franchise Bill will be followed by a measure providing for a redistribution of seats in Parliament. The pledge of such a purpose should be taken by the Lords, as well as it was by the Commonsthe party, after all, most deeply interested -as decisive and satisfactory. But, as we

weaknesses of the ministerial course abroad, the Lords and their supporters would fain hope to draw the nation from its purpose of securing Parliamentary re-

with what result? The curtailment of the powers of the Lords as an independent legislative chamber, and finally their effacement. Even so conservative a journal as the Tablet was, after last session, compelled to raise a warning voice to the hereditary legislators :

"Has the House of Lords suddenly become what the Scotch call fey, that in a moment it has needlessly destroyed all the painfully won work of the session, and, seemingly, in sheer gaiety? The superstition is, that in the presence of impending calamity the doomed man is visited with an unnatural gladness and lightness of heart, and some such theory seems needed to explain the irresponsible conduct of the Peers. Four months of a busy session were spent in making and shaping the Bill of the Commons, and then it goes up to the other House only to receive its coup de grace at the hands of Lord Salisbury. Even if the majority of the Peers have been opposed to the principle of the Bill, they might well have hesitated once and twice and three times before pursuing the course they have taken. But they are not opposed to it: they welcome it with open arms, and then deliberately choose open arms, and then deliberately choose to make vain the work of a session, and to enter upon an irreconcilable conflict with the Commons upon a point of mere method of procedure. We grant you that if the debate had been only an academic discussion, and empty of consequence, the speech of Lord Cairns might have been taken as making good the abstract desira-bility of uniting the questions of Redistribution and Reform in a single Bill. But no such idle position of separateness and aloofness can be claimed for the Peers. They must recognize that their deeds will have a long sequel, and know that they are not free, but bound by circumstance, and, above all, by the action of their own friends in the Lower House We have, from the first, tried to impress upon the Tory party that their true course was at once to welcome the Reform Bill bution bill. As to what had been said on and to concentrate all effort upon the question of Redistribution. If that course had been followed—if the Conservatives in the Commons had adopted anything like the attitude towards the extending of the franchise which has been taken up by the majority in the House of Lords, the Government would have had no option but at once to bring in a Bill dealing with the more difficult and far more complithe Redistribution cated question of the Redistribution. But they did nothing of the kind-the followers, or perhaps we should say the leaders, of Sir Stafford Northcote, op-posed the Bill in a hundred ways, and with only this result, that they supplied just the justification which was wanting resolve of the Ministry not to im peril the passage of the Reform Bill by up with any other question It was the folly of the Oppowhatever. sition which made it possible for the Gov-ernment to proclaim that they would see the Reform Bill hung up safely out of all that the House of Lords should have a danger before bringing in a measure dealnot now rightly complain of conduct on

> The Lords last session blundered, and are prepared, it appears, to repeat their

hatred of the Liberals as in 1832. were the peers? he asked. They were the spawn of blunder, wars and corruption of the dark ages of our history. They had entered the temple of honor, not through the temple of merit, but through the sepulchres of their ancestors. They were no better than their fathers. Some of them worse, for their privileges had produced ignorance and arrogance. The reform of the House of Lords was urgent and inevitable. The creation of new peers to pass a franchise bill would only get rid of the present difficulty. What was wanwould not shrink from bowing to their ted was limitation of the veto power of the lords. Should the people submit or should they curb the nobles as their fath-ers had curbed the kings of England? He would allow the peers to retain their present power during the first session that a bill should be presented them, but he would absolutely preclude them from would absolutely preclude them from vetoing the franchise bill or any bill a second time. Many persons, no doubt, would think him too lenient to the peers,

Just before the opening of the present session M. Labouchere, in his organ "Truth." employed terms of the severest

menace to the Lords: "It would not surprise me." he said "were we to see somewhat rough times when the Lords throw out the Franchise Bill for the second time. The people are still in good humour, because they cannot bring themselves to believe that twenty or thirty hereditary nonentities, whose very names are unknown to them, can possibly have the assurance to put themselves against Mr. Gladstone with the country at his back. The impudence of these worthy gentlemen is indeed so astounding have said, the upper chamber has no real desire to see passed either a Franchise Bill or one for the redistribution of seats. Its purpose is plainly to hamper the ministry and bring about a dissolution, in which and bring about a dissolution, in which case the foreign and not the domestic policy of the government would by them be made, if possible, the chief topic of discussion. By fastening attention on the

people are apt to fall back upon first principles. Our ancestors made short work with monarchs who endeavored to force the church of Rome is its superiority as form through the extension of the fran-chise and the readjustment of represen-tation.

From present indications it appears certain that the Marquis of Salisbury will pursue his course of obstruction. But with what result? The curtailment of about as much notion of the indignation which only awaits a spark in order to break forth into flame, as the fatted oxen efore Christmas of what is likely to be fall them."

Neither would it surprise us were ively times to follow the second rejection of the Franchise Bill. True, the peers may be enabled by that course to force Mr. Gladstone to a dissolution. But it is certain that on an appeal to the constituencies he will suffer no Parliamentary loss. His hands will be strengthened, while the peers must, of necessity, lose in prestige and influence. For the lords we have no sympathy. They have shown themselves bitter enemies, not only of civil, but of religious freedom. Among their number are some of the bitterest foes of Catholicity. Their very maintenance in their present position is, we venture to think, an obstacle of the most pronounced character to the spread of Catholicity in Britain. They are, as a body, interested in the preservation of the state church, which is the bulwark of Protestant ascendency, and the pillar of religious inequality. If they fall, as we trust they will fall, may they so fall as to sink beyond hope or power of resurrection. May they in death be as unhonored as in life, and their death be a warning to aristocrats and monopolists elsewhere of the danger to which a minority, powerful solely by gold and lands, exposes itself by seeking to override the legitimate wishes of the people.

THAT DISGRACEFUL OATH.

We take great pleasure in commend ing the action of the Hon. Mr. Masson, Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec, for refusing, on his accession to office, the oath of apostacy for Catholics and of qualified allegiance for Protestants, tendered such officials. Mr. Masson felt that he could not in conscience take the following

oath :_ "I do swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Victoria, and will defend her to the utmost of my power against all con spiracies and attempts whatever which shall be made against her person, crown or dignity, and I will do my deavor to disclose and make known to Her Majesty, her heirs and successors all treasons and traitorous conspiracie which may be formed against her, or them and I do faithfully promise to maintain, support and defend to the utmost of my power the succession of the Crown, which succession by an Act intituled, "An Act for the further limitation of the Crown and better securing the rights and liber ties of the subject," is and stands limited to the Princess Sophia, Electress of Hanover, and to the heirs of her body, being Protestants, hereby utterly re nouncing and abjuring any obedience allegiance unto any other person claim ing, or pretending, a right to the Crown of this realm, and I do declare that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate, hath, or has, a right to have any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or his declaration upon the true faith of a Christian, so help me God."

We cannot for the life of us see how any man calling himself Catholic could have ever taken any such oath, or how this standing insult to the faith of nearly one half the people of the Dominion could have been so long permitted to remain unremoved. The Montreal Gar zette says of this shameful oath :

"It is quite clear that no Roman Cathoa denial of the spiritual or ecclesiastical authority of the Pope of Rome. In this country where we have formally declared the separation of church and state, where all forms of religious belief are equal in the eyes of the law, such an oath ought not to be imposed upon a Canadian official, and Mr. Masson is to be congratulated upon having refused to

And the Ottawa Free Press states

"We have always had a high opinion

of Mr. Masson's manliness and hon esty; and that favorable opinion has been intensified by his manly action in the present case. We say "manly action," because no sin-cere Roman Catholic can subscribe to the terms of that oath, without violating one of the first claims of his church, and wounding his conscience if he be a true No country has anything to gain in a moral aspect by searing the coniences of any class of its citizens. The oath as tendered to Mr. Masson, and not only an insult to every Roman Cath

olic but to every person standing outside the pale of the Episcopal church as in England established. It must not be England established. forgotten that the Protestants meant d implied in that oath are merely the It is unnecessary to enter into the ques-tion of the Protestant succession in Great Britain, for it is a matter which little concerns us in this country. We discuss it upon its merits as Canadians
—and not as English, Scotch or Irishmen. As Canadians we have no state

a spiritual power to all powers tem-poral."

We hope that we have now heard the last of this "Protestant succession" oath. Such a relic of post-reformation barbarism is altogether out of place in this free country. This Protestant succession business has brought more diseredit on the British crown and monarchy than all its armed enemies together could effect. It has morally and intellectually debased the House of Hanover, till imbecillity, stupidity, insanity and moral obliquity seem inseparably associated with a family that might otherwise have been venerated for good qualities that this cruel law of the Protestant succession has removed from its

Since the above writing we have seen it stated in L'Etendard that by an order from London bearing date, October, 1878, the formula of allegiance of Governors General and Lieutenant-Governors had been changed and that it was by error the Marquis of Lansdowne was sworn in on the disgraceful oath above recited. The following is the form of oath taken by Lieut.-Gov. Masson. Louis Rodrigue Masson, swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to Her Majesty Queen Victoria. So help me God."

DIVORCE IN CANADA.

The London Free Press, in its issue of the 6th of November, mourns the fact that there are already no fewer than six notices published in the Canada Gazette of applications for divorce. Three are filed on behalf of husbands and three on behalf of wives. The grounds on which the applications are based are, in each case, adultery and desertion. These are, according to our law, the only grounds upon which action can lie for divorce.

We could not, we must confess, help feeling amused when we read in the Free Press the recital of the procedure followed in divorce suits :

"All the evidence," says our contempor ary, "has to go before the Senate, and the issue is determined by that body. Often the testimony, no matter how unsavory is dragged out for weary hours in committee, and the time of the House occupied with petty and scandalous details which had much better come before a justice in chambers than a legislative body. It is rather a relic of a past age than, as i should be, an adaptation of modern usage Affairs at state may be ever so pressing, ye these cases, involving mere questions personal infelicity, are supposed to be taken up and sifted out by honorable senators, as though they were of national concerns the most weighty, just as, in the time of the Second Charles, the Lords in Council sat hearing such suits as that of an old man for alimentary support, almost in presence of an invading fleet, which was thought by the chroniclers of that day a rather petty business for such a body at so grave a crisis."

What, we ask, does the Free Press take

the people of Canada for? Are they so blind, so ignorant, or so stupid, that they should be treated to such a farcical statement as this. The people of Canada know something of the Senate. That venerable body, for days and days at a time, devotes, with a magnanimity beyond all praise, ten or twenty minutes to public business spiritual, within this realm, and I make and then adjourns. If it were not for the divorce suits the Senate would have little else to do except at the end of the session of course, for many of its honorable members who carefully abstain from the filthpoking indulged in by the committee on ratio is about I to 7." divorce bills-will not, we think, feel by any means grateful for the proposal of the matters of matrimonial infelicity. The Free Press poses in this matter as the poor of such urgency as divorce there should be great expedition and little expense, and goes almost as far as to advocate annexation in its admiration of the better speed with which suits for divorce are hurried through in the neighboring union. Our contemporary suggests as a solution of the England, where such causes may be heard and determined on their merits, like any other matter, than wait on the commenceaware that the English divorce court is only to aristocratic infamy and gilded for divorce :

"Nor should the grounds of action be restricted to the special offence indicated. Incompatibility of temper, leading to Protestants of the Church of England. gross and repeated acts of violence, ought to be held as a sufficient rea-on for di-vorce. By what law of nature should two persons who must be ever at war be are here to treat of this question and The wife may be in daily peril of assault from a cruel and drunke one who is naturally brutal and ferocious without being drunken, and may live in a continual state of alarm and hatred, and

is attended with the sense of dependance is attended with the sense of dependance and a continual dread of insult and out-rage. The husband on the other hand may be subjected to every species of tor-ment that eccentricity or malignity can in-vent, but all goes for nothing. He can vent, but all goes for nothing. He can get no effectual relief unless he can prove n addition that his partner had guilty of a shameful crime. The very act that this effense is legally required as the first ingredient of an action offers a direct premium for its commis-sion; and cases have been known wherein, in order to afford the basis for a divorce which every natural feeling called for and justified, the offence which has been specified was deliberately arranged, with all its attendant shame and exposure. Generous, high-toned, moral journal!

Taking this city as an instance, we defy the Free Press to say there is any considerable or even noticeable number of cases of such cruelty on the part of husbands or malignity on the part of wives as he speaks of. But establish a divorce court, and liver complaint will often be taken for cruelty-peevishness for malignity. Establish a divorce court, and there will be put a premium on conjugal infidelity. We have before us in this matter the experience of our American brethren, and a sadder experience we could not have in mind. Well, indeed, did our esteemed contemporary, the True Witness, some weeks ago declare that the divorce laws which prevail in so many states of the Union are certainly an awful havoc on the ranks of society. The sacredness of marriage is, as that journal justly points out, scouted and sneered at. Thousands to-day in the United States are governed by the belief that the marriage tie is a temporary convenience, and that where it becomes a restraint it can be easily discarded. This is truly but one step from "spontaneous divorce," and but another from promiscuity. In many places the first of these steps has been taken, the poor apparently thinking that by private arrangement they can effect that which, if submitted to the law, must be costly. The

for this moral degradation. "Competent authority," continues the that the ratio of Witness, "states livorces to marriages has doubled within the last 30 years, while the present in-crease is even greater. The Ohio Divorce Reform League has collected statistics regarding the question, which disclose an alarming state of affairs. Dealing partiwith the State of Ohio, the report of the Reform League shows that in 1865 the number of divorces granted in Ohio was 673, and 1,965 in 1883. This is an increase of 233 per cent, in 19 years. The population increased but 36 per cent., and the number of marriages 30 per cent. during the same period. The ratio in the former year was 1 to 26; in the latter The ratio in the former year was was I to 16. In 1883 Ashtabula county gave a ratio of 1 to 4, and of 1 petition or divorce to about every 2 marriages In three counties in the northern part of the State the ratio of divorces to marriages is, omitting decimals, 1 to 5. In 9 counties, mostly in the north and west, it is 1 to 7. In 43 counties scattered throughout the State, the fewest being in the south east, it is I to 10. confesses that the evil is increasing every

many states of the Union are responsible

day.
"Statistics for other States were found to be difficult of access, but the following will indicate the drift of the country: New England granted 2,113 divorces in 1878. Connecticut, in 1846, granted divorce to every 25 marriages. By 18 this ratio had so increased that it was I divorce to 10 marriages for a period of fifteen years. Rhode Island, Maine and ties of Michigan furnish a ratio of 1 to 13. 200 divorces annually and in Philadelphia the number rose from 10 in 1862 to 477 in 1882. In 29 counties of California the

Will these figures satisfy our city contemporary that a divorce court is an un-Free Press to divest it of jurisdiction in desirable luxury? Or is our contemporary, after having achieved such distinction in reporting seduction cases, so man's friend. It desires that in an affair | eager to supply its readers with the sensational that it must, at any cost to society and to the state, have a divorce court at its doors? We have so often argued the question of divorce from the standard of principle that we will not repeat ourselves. We will, however, direct the attention of our neighbor to difficulty in Canada the establishment of a an article from the pen of the learned regular divorce court, "the same as in Dr. Mahar, published some weeks ago in the Cleveland Universe. The gitted writer points out that the present outrageous laws on the score of divorce in ment of Parliament." Is our friend not most of the states were made at a time when Biblical teachings were held in one of the most expensive in the world, more general reverence than at present, that the poor man has no chance of ever and as those plain teachings could not getting there, that its portals are opened effect a greater approach to the truth then, it is not likely that they shamelessness? But the Free Press thinks would at this late day, when it may which he refused to take, we believe, is that a wider scope than even adultery and well be doubted whether any unquesdesertion should be afforded those seeking | tioned Bible law would have decisive weight in the legislature of any of the States. Dr. Mahar adds that in the United States they are approaching the degradation of the old Roman Empire, in whose days the Roman matrons could reckon their divorces by the years of their age. He shows that this downward course is but a logical development of the reformation, for wherever that deformity entered it was found necessary at once to relax the moral code. Hence the history of the early reformers is a testant succession—as Canadians we hold that in matters ecclesiastical the state has no right of interference, unless separate maintenance, if the husband can is maintained in our own day by that state has no right of interference, unless separate maintenance, if the husband can is maintained in our own day by that director of this school. He did not lose the ecclesiastical authorities try to in-

Protestantism performed before. Does not the "Revolution," as the general anti-Catholic movement for a century back on the Continent has been styled, show the identical moral weakness of the "Reformation." Is it not true that wherever this "boastful movement of this century has gained influence divorce laws have been introduced, or attempted at least. What could more plainly show that the grace of God is not in these movements?"

As the American people drift farther away from even the few plain, positive precepts which their ancestors drew from the Sacred Scriptures, we must, as Dr. Mahar very forcibly indicates, expect a still greater departure from proper moral legislation. Would the Free Press have us follow the downward march of the infidel communities of the prairies, or of effete commonwealths on the Atlantic seaboard? If so, we commend to his attention the following sound reflections from the same article in the Universe:

"Divorces are a good index of moral decadence, and a movement to change legislation regarding them is an indication of similar import. Marriage has so long and universally been a subject of legislation, matrimonial vicissitudes are so simi-lar the world over, that progress in laws on the subject can only come from a better religious knowledge. A clamor there-fore for new laws of matrimony can only mean a recognition of moral decadence, for nobody can claim that there is true or more general knowledge of religion in the country now than at a previous period. One of the two: the clamor arises from a better appreciation of morality or from an appreciation of the fact of worse immorality. The former is untrue beyond

a doubt, the latter remains." We will conclude by reminding the Free Press that a divorce court, whether after an English or an American model, cannot be etablished in this country without grievously wounding the conscientious feelings and convictions of one-half our people. We desire further to add that, in so far as the divorce laws unhappily established in so Province of Quebec is concerned, no court established in this country could, in our estimation, take cognizance of petitions of divorce mensa et thoro. The decrees of the Council of Trent are in force in that Province. They were in force at the time of the conquest, and, therefore, substantially form part and parcel of the Treaty of Paris (1763).

We hope that the day is far distant when any Province of Canada will be reduced to the same level of moral degradation as the northern reserve in Ohio, or the sickly states of Vermont and Rhode Island. We want here a manly race. But, if we welcome divorce, we bid good bye to manliness, to truth and honor and purity. We want here female virtue : but. give us divorce, and then begins the reign of shame and debasement.

A NEW SUPERIOR-GENERAL.

In Le Moniteur de Rome we read that the general chapter of the Institute of Christian Brothers, assembled to select a successor to the venerated and regretted Brother Irlide, has made choice of Brother Joseph, one of the assistants of the defunct superior-general. The election of Brother Joseph will be welcomed with joy by the whole society, by all interested in the good works it directs Hampshire gave a ratio of 1 to 10 and by the faithful friends and generous 78. Chicago, Louisville and 24 counpairs it has everywhere secured. patrons it has everywhere secured. Called in 1874 to fill the position of done. The Senate—making exception, divorces are increasing 50 per cent. faster dashed assistant to Brother Olympe, Brother than marriages. In St. Louis there are by the government a member of the Superior Council of Public Instruction

as a representative of the free schools In this body, so ill disposed in general to the education imparted by religious, Brother Joseph won respect and esteem by the dignity of his character, the firmness and independence of his counsels. the rectitude of his judgment, his modesty and rare good sense.

These eminent qualities will greatly facilitate the discharge of his present onerous duties Combining the humility of Brother Phillip with the energy of Brother Irlide, fortified by the same en lightened and profound piety which was theirs, he will be enabled to preserve and defend as well as to increase the noble heritage now confided to him

The Paris Universe gives a touching account of Brother Joseph's election, the translation of which we borrow from the N. Y. Freeman's Journal:

"The Brother deputed to announce the election, said: "Dear Brother Joseph, you are the Superior General of our Society." Brother Joseph's eves filled with tears. He received tokens of obe dience from the members of the chapter. and then proceeded to the chapel of the community, where the Te Deum was sung. In the chapel, the new Superior ccupies the stall left vacant by Brother Irlide; the exercises were terminated by prayer by Brother Joseph for the son

of his regretted predecessor.

Brother Joseph, known in the world as Joseph-Marie Josserand, was born at St. Etienne, March 30, 1823. He was one of the first pupils of the "little novi-tiate" of the Brothers, which he entered June 9, 1836. On March 3, 1838, h was admitted into the "grand novitiate. In 1842, he directed the first class; in 1845, he was sent as professor to a school in the Rue France-Bourgeois, Paris, which was the scene of his greatest energy and zeal. In 1852, he was made counts over for bers. On Apriwas elected A Institute, and pation to live Brother Josep soul to the cau BELGIA The Ottawa the 10th inst., "The clerica have nearly r tether. They ing to lessen

tobacco which tand then used the educations f facts gives gether to the sectarian journ to circulate. ducational la cing the vario party and brou aprising that election Liber even places whe The writer hopelessly go entirely ignor affairs in Belgi electorate of B

the all import

The so-called which came inaugurated t were ruthles school law, intent of whi the rising ge deep and inte did the passag was termed by Free Press is heur and a fi upon the Cath to drive the devised and o project. The was fought ou cals were beat defeat with ceeded in frig wno has, alas devoid of th monarch's h thing the Fre radicalism car obtain mome triumphs influ tors than the derstand our sectarian jour in the Domini sectarian in t it is the Free

Our reader lately advoca respected Pro Lieutenant-G did so out o the minority Masson's appo ing changes have gained g is to the effe Robertson, of retire for Me whereat the the Globe was

The conte

Cabinet, and of the Englis

more stir am

THE Q

ssible with look like a d ation is now of Waterloo have had, ha fidelity to his not care how has got all h tral Railway bankrupt Pr was surprised his broad li in favour of testants one few of the B Eastern Tow their English going West their places. ever, will in at the next

> result he s Protestant, may take league. Ac English-spe are entitled the Cabine had two. nothing to Catholics o respectable Mr. Carbra Legislature

Messrs. L

deed, as the

to think, l