

The Catholic Record

Published every Friday morning at 428 Richmond Street.
Annual subscription, \$2.00
Six months, \$1.00

Advertisements for one, two, three, six, or twelve months, at special rates. All advertisements should be handed in not later than Tuesday morning.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.
All matter intended for publication must have the name of the writer attached, and must reach the office not later than Tuesday noon of each week.

THOS. COFFEY,
Publisher and Proprietor.
LETTER FROM HIS LORDSHIP BISHOP WALSH.

LONDON, Ont., May 23, 1878.
DEAR MR. COFFEY:—As you have become proprietor and publisher of the CATHOLIC RECORD, I deem it my duty to announce to its subscribers and patrons that the change of proprietorship will work no change in its one and principles; that it will remain, what it has been, thoroughly Catholic, entirely independent of political parties, and exclusively devoted to the cause of the Church and to the promotion of Catholic interests. I am confident that under your experienced management the RECORD will improve in usefulness and efficiency; and I therefore earnestly commend it to the patronage and encouragement of the clergy and laity of the diocese. Believe me,
Yours very sincerely,
JOHN WALSH,
Bishop of London.

Mr. THOMAS COFFEY,
Office of the "Catholic Record."

Catholic Record.

LONDON, FRIDAY, MAR. 11, 1881.

Lenten Regulations for the Diocese of London for 1881.

1st. All the week days of Lent, from Ash Wednesday till Easter Sunday, are fast days of precept on one meal, with the allowance of a moderate collation in the evening.

2nd. General usage has made it lawful to take in the morning some tea or coffee, with a morsel of bread.

3rd. The precept of fasting implies also that of abstinence. But by a dispensation from the Holy See, A. D. 1874, for ten years, the use of flesh meat is allowed in this Diocese at the principal meal on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays of Lent, with the exception of the Saturday in Ember week and Easter Saturday.

4th. There is neither fast nor abstinence to be observed on Sundays of Lent.

5th. It is not allowed to use fish with flesh meat at the same meal in Lent.

6th. There is prohibition to use eggs, butter, or cheese, provided the rule of the quantity prescribed by the law of the fast be complied with.

7th. Land may be used in preparing fish, vegetables, etc., etc., when butter cannot be easily procured.

8th. The Church excuses from the obligation of fasting (but not of abstinence from flesh meat, except in special cases of sickness or the like), the following classes of persons: First, the infirm; second, those whose duties are of an onerous or laborious character; third, persons who are under the age of twenty-one years; fourth, women in pregnancy or nursing infants; fifth, those who are enfeebled by old age, and all who through any cause cannot fast without great prejudice to their health.

Persons who are in doubt as to whether, in their circumstances, they are bound by the law of fast and abstinence should consult their confessor or pastor, and should follow his direction in the matter.

By order of His Lordship the Bishop, W. O'MAHONY, Secretary.

THE LATE MONSIGNOR CAZEAU.

In the death of this venerable and deeply-regretted Prelate the church of Canada has lost a distinguished ornament. The pious, polished priest and gentleman is no more; Society will long mourn him; but how many hundreds of sorrowing hearts—especially amongst Irish Catholics—have lost a kind friend and counsellor is known only to One. It is only a little over a year ago that his fiftieth year in the priesthood was celebrated with joy and gladness in the city of Quebec; the rejoicings extended over some ten days and a reference to our files will show that they were participated in by all classes of the community and that congratulations came to him from far off friends and admirers. It was on this auspicious occasion that Bishop Persico of the united dioceses of Aquin, Pontorosso and Sora (in Italy) created him a canon of his cathedral—a dignity which entitled him to wear the episcopal ring and mitre. The latter his humility would not allow him to assume; a magnificent ring was presented to him by the family of the late Lieutenant Governor Caron. At the same time His Grace of Toronto constituted him a Vicar General of the Archdiocese—a step which reflected honor both on the bestower and the recipient of the dignity, and caused unmixed pleasure and pride to Archbishop Lynch's countrymen in Quebec.

The venerable deceased never tired of doing good. The widow, the orphan—in a word, all who were in trouble or affliction, had in him a sure friend to whom no trouble was a consideration; and he died as he had lived—"doing good." On Sunday, the 29th February, he celebrated the

Community Mass at the Good Shepherd Convent as usual; he gave Holy Communion to the Nuns, to those he loved so dearly—the Penitents—for he was truly the "Good Shepherd" who thinks it no trouble to go in search of the "lost one of the flock," and having found it, puts it on his shoulder and carries it back to its home, and rejoices; to the other inmates of the Convent, besides a larger number of persons residing in the neighborhood who approached the Holy Table. To each and every one of these it will be a pleasing souvenir of "Father Cazeau" to reflect that they had received at his hands at this his last celebration of the Holy Mysteries here below that veritable Bread of Life of which he is now partaking, we have no doubt, in Eternity. Oh! what a pleasing reflection for those who enjoy his happiness.

After mass he heard confessions, and again in the afternoon, as well as giving an instruction first in French and afterwards in English, on that virtue for which during his life he was so eminently distinguished—Charity. He also officiated at Benediction at five o'clock. On the Monday the fatal malady—inflammation of the lungs—declared itself, and continued to baffle the skill of his medical attendants. On Thursday a number of the Bishops and clergy called to see him, and his state was found to be so precarious that His Grace, Archbishop Taschereau thought it well to warn him of his condition. "He received my words," says His Grace, "with confidence, gratitude and joy." His Grace himself essayed the administration of the Sacraments, but his emotion was too great, and he was obliged to call upon the Bishop of Chicoutimi to officiate.

Monsignor Cazeau breathed his last on the morning of Saturday, at ten minutes past one. During that day and the Sunday the body lay in state at the foot of that altar at which for very nearly twenty-five years he had daily offered the Holy Sacrifice. The number of visitors, especially on Sunday, was something immense. On Monday morning solemn high mass was celebrated by the Bishop of Rimouski in presence of His Grace and the Bishops of Sherbrooke and Chicoutimi, and a large number of clergymen as well as a large congregation. On Monday afternoon the body was translated to the Basilica, attended by a very large cortege. The members of St. Patrick's Literary Institute turned out en corps bearing mourning badges and were given the next place in the procession to the relatives and the clergy; they were also provided with special seats in the Basilica. The Bishop of Sherbrooke officiated, and the office for the dead was recited. On Tuesday morning Solemn High Mass was celebrated by His Grace the Archbishop, who also delivered the funeral oration. This was indeed a glowing tribute to the memory of the faithful Priest, the protector of the widow and the orphan, the veritable "Good Shepherd" and the wise and prudent and far-seeing counsellor. Few of course there are who could speak with more certainty than the Archbishop and it was plain that he did not consider himself by any means the least amongst the sufferers on this occasion.

Two works remain which will during all time endear the memory of the illustrious deceased to all Christians. His active, yet almost superhuman, exertions on behalf of the famine and fever-stricken Irish Exiles of 1847—"who fleeing from famine and pestilence in their own land reached America to find but a grave." He was charged with the supplying of constant relays of priests who understood the English language both for Grosse Isle and the hospitals in the city. He also charged himself with the providing of homes for the poor little waifs who were deprived of home and parents. Nor did he then abandon them. He followed them with a paternal care. He corresponded with them, he visited them. Some years ago in the depth of winter one whom he always spoke of as his "little Ellen" was lying on her deathbed in her convent home at Lachine near Montreal. Her desire to once more see him who had indeed been a father to her was communicated to him. Immediately he set out—notwithstanding the inclement season and

his nearly seventy years of age, and she had her last wish gratified. This is only one out of many, many instances of his constant care and watchfulness over those to whom he had become a father. "My children," as he loved to call them, were ever uppermost in his mind, judging by his conversation; it was almost an impossibility to be in his company for half an hour without some reference being made to them or to the Irish people generally. It is not quite a month since, that a respected clergyman of the diocese of London called upon him accompanied by a lay friend. As usual the conversation turned upon "unfortunate, but ever-faithful Ireland." In the course of it, mention was made of certain action taken in her behalf, but which Monsignor Cazeau had not yet heard of. Next day the layman received a note from him saying that he had read the proceedings alluded to and—added he—"I concur very sincerely in that step, because I do not see any other means to deliver Ireland from starvation. . . . I wish that the Imperial Government may act as wisely as did the Government of Canada about the Seigneurial Tenure." This document will surely be a precious one to its possessor. But why enlarge on the great love, the Charity of Father Cazeau for the Irish people? 'Tis well known, but perhaps the following short excerpt from a letter from another well-known Irish Priest of the diocese of London received within a few days will not be considered superfluous: "I don't think there was ever a man in Canada who gained greater popularity with every creed and nationality than Monsignor Cazeau, without ever forgetting that he was at the same time a French Canadian Priest. While he loved the Irish people with a sincere love still he was a thorough patriotic French Canadian, which goes to show that he had a place for everybody in his great heart. May God have Mercy on his soul!"

Another work which will perpetuate his memory is the Asylum of the Good Shepherd, of which he has acted as Chaplain—of which he has been the "right arm," so to say—for nearly a quarter of a century. With what hopefulness was the celebration of his silver jubilee in this position looked forward to on the 15th of May next? And what a grievous disappointment to his spiritual children the good sisters? And a sad and desolate appearance did that institution present on that fatal Saturday morning. The family of religious was cast into the most profound and heartrending sorrow; one by one they came to cast themselves on their knees beside that bed whereon lay all that was mortal of their father—of their friend! And the penitents—those who were so particularly dear to his "great heart"? What a sorrowful scene it was. Sighs and groans were heard on all sides—for who could console them for their loss? How expressive was the homage thereby paid to that heart so full of Charity, which had now ceased to beat here below, but which assuredly does not cease to watch over these who were so dear to it.

But again why enlarge on the Charity of Father Cazeau. One or two occurrences must suffice to bring this very imperfect notice to a close; but whatever the style, it has indeed been a "labor of love" on the part of one who has ever and will ever continue to the end of his days to hold the memory of the deceased Prelate in the highest veneration. One day he met a young child in the streets who was crying bitterly. Stopping his vehicle he enquired of the child the cause of his trouble. The latter replied that his father told him to deliver a letter which he held in his hand, but he did not know where to deliver it, and he was afraid he would be scolded. Taking the letter from the child, the kindhearted priest bade him go home and tell his father "that Father Cazeau had undertaken its delivery." On another occasion he met a little boy who was also in tears. Enquiry elicited the fact that he had been sent by his father to collect a certain sum due him, that he had received imperative orders not to return without the money, but that he feared he would not be successful. Father Cazeau consoled the child and accompanying

him to his father's debtor, so took the latter by surprise that he had paid the amount almost before he knew what he was about. Needless to say that the child went on his way rejoicing.

IRELAND AND AMERICA.

The generous expressions of sympathy with Ireland on the part of American people through various of their representative bodies has drawn from an esteemed contemporary, the *New York Tablet*, some just terms of commendation. The sympathy of the Canadian people for Ireland, while very strong, has not yet found any such expression as has been given to American sympathy. This fact does not, however, prevent our endorsing the views of the *Tablet*. Our contemporary says:

"It should be a source of the greatest consolation to us to witness the genuine and warm-hearted sympathy which broad-minded Americans have ever extended to Ireland, especially in times of sore distress, when famine scourged her children, or when she felt the iron hoof of tyranny press upon her more heavily than usual. Not alone have mere sentiments of hopefulness and sympathy been given expression to by the representative heads of this great republic, but, furthermore, those noble sentiments have taken practical shape. Generous-hearted Columbia poured her treasures with unstinted hand into the lap of Erin; and thus saved thousands upon thousands of our people who might otherwise have fished on the highway or been consigned, uncondemned and unshrunk, to a pauper's nameless and unheeded grave. They say 'republics are ungrateful.' It is false, or else the United States makes the glorious exception to the rule."

The Irish people have been always firm friends of America. The late action of the citizens of the great republic—for great it truly is in generosity—will cement the friendship between both peoples. The *Tablet* recalls past instances of Irish friendship for America:

"When the colonies were struggling to free themselves from the cruel yoke under which Irishmen wrote to-day, whose voice was it that rang loudest in the British Senate in angry protest against the law in which this country was then treated? It was the voice of Burke and Fox, who, with their soft Irish brogue, hurled their fierce words against the tyranny that forced the enactment of taxation without representation upon the colonies. And when, at length, the flag of revolt was unfurled, whose were the brawny arms that braved the terrors of the battle-field in defence of their adopted land, giving their Irish blood to help Americans to win their freedom? They were Irish blood and bone, as Washington himself testified when from his Presidential chair he expressed his gratitude and the gratitude of the country to the Irish Catholics for their heroic sacrifices in helping him to achieve independence. In the war of 1812, too, our countrymen rushed to the front; and it is needless to refer to their headlong valor in defence of the Union on a hundred battle-fields during the late war, when England was exulting in the prospect of seeing those United States torn asunder with internal strife. The American people are not, they cannot be ungrateful of those stern, stubborn facts, and we are more than delighted to see that, whenever they are afforded an opportunity, they are but too eager to recognize and reciprocate the efforts of Irishmen in the cause and maintenance of freedom in this liberty-loving land. Republicans as well as Democrats have thus practically proved themselves worthy of their well-earned fame for off-handed generosity towards our struggling nationality, and for this reason, in the future as in the past, Irishmen shall prove again and again with their heart's blood, if necessary, the love they bear the land of their adoption. But they long to obtain their just rights, for they blush in their manhood to see the begging-box eternally going round while robbed of the fruits of their industry at home by those vampires known as Ireland's spendthrift landlords."

No wonder then that our contemporary rejoices at the late marked display of American gratitude:

"And Americans, we are glad to see, seem to take a pride in Irishmen standing boldly up for their rights at last, instead of crawling to the throne to be whipped away like worthless curs from the presence of royalty. In testimony of their admiration for this manly course of action on the part of Irishmen, Congress recently passed resolutions of sympathy in their behalf. The same course of action has been taken in the New York, Rhode Island, Illinois, West Virginia, and California State Assemblies, as well as elsewhere throughout the Union. At Albany, particularly, last Monday, was the feudalism of England denounced, because, as the resolution stated, the system was felt there with bitter effect in colonial days, as well as in other parts of this State. The warmest sympathy and best wishes of the Assembly were accordingly extended towards struggling Ireland, with expressions of profound regret at the course pursued by the British Government in attempting to crush the Irish people 'by coercion.' The resolution, which was proposed by Mr. Cowles, was carried by an overwhelming vote.

The various legislative bodies above enumerated, have indeed done honor to themselves and to the American people. They have, by denouncing the wrongs heaped on Ireland, done that noble but unfortunate country a service she will never forget. Even if misfortune should still continue to be her lot, her gratitude—so deep and so generous is Irish gratitude—will enable

her, out of her very poverty and suffering, to return the favor one hundredfold.

The concluding paragraph of the *Tablet's* article deserves special attention:

"Our leaders should feel inspired with fresh courage when they see such noble expressions of sympathy like this wafted to them over the wave from the free land, and Irishmen of every type, extreme or moderate, should do their utmost to earn more and more the esteem and respect of this great country by restraining their impulses and keeping within the bounds of common sense; for if the Americans again see anything in the shape of fiascos and scapegrace stampedes, they will lose all confidence in us, and regard us only as a nation of brave but brainless enthusiasts. Let us, therefore, by our coolness in this great crisis of our country's history, show to the world that we are indeed worthy of the freedom to which we aspire."

Too frequently indeed has the cause of Ireland suffered through folly and indiscretion. We have no reason to think it will now suffer in that way. The land agitation has thus far been conducted with zeal, firmness and prudence. The Irish leaders, by pursuing the policy which has so far guided them, cannot, we would fain believe, fall of success.

THE BRITISH PEERAGE.

For many years past the question of abolishing the Peerage in England, as a distinct branch of Parliament, has been brought more or less prominently before the public. The utterly unjustifiable course pursued by the Lords last year on the Irish question made it evident that the hereditary chamber cannot be long maintained. While containing many men of merit, the House of Lords has not been able of late years to retain the respect of the public. We do, we must confess, share the view lately expressed by a writer of keen observation. He says:

"The British peerage, we fancy, is doomed—or, at least, the House of Lords as a hereditary branch of the National Legislature. With the example of France before them, it is not likely that the most radical of English reformers will care to demand the abolition of titles of nobility; and a second chamber is a desideratum in government. Even were the House of Peers to cease to exist, that would not cause material sorrow to such men as the Duke of Argyll, the Marquis of Salisbury, Earl Granville, Lord Beaconsfield, Lord Rosebery, Lord Derby, Lord Dufferin, or a score of other noblemen that might be named; who would make their mark in any legislative assembly. But the English Radicals do not take kindly to an hereditary House, nor do we blame them for their reluctance to permit its existence. We shall probably see the Bishops go first; then, as the present peers die out, their legislative functions will cease, instead of descending to their successors in their titles, and their places in the British Senate will be taken by life-peers, men eminent in the various walks of life, and especially politicians and statesmen advanced in years. To such a chamber no exception could be taken. It is altogether likely that we shall see such a chamber within the next decade, and if the peers should withstand the passage of a Land Law, or any other great popular measure, we shall see it within the next three years."

So long as the Peerage is entrusted with legislative functions, none of its privileges can be abolished with its consent. It has ever upheld the interests of the landed classes to the detriment of the tenantry in Britain as well as Ireland. We do not, we are free to say, look for any justice to the tenantry of the latter country from the Lords, even though Mr. Gladstone should introduce a just measure of land reform.

A MODEL IRISHMAN.

The following telegram from Halifax will give consolation and joy to the true Catholic heart. Patrick Power became a wealthy man. He gave his children a good education—good in the highest and noblest sense of the term. He bestowed a goodly share of his enormous wealth on them, as well as on other relatives and friends whom he considered had a fair claim on a portion of it. But while his affections clung most ardently around his children and his earthly home, he did not forget the claims of God's Church and God's poor. Many a prayer will ascend to heaven from the lips of the unfortunate whom his bounty will make comfortable—many a prayer will also be offered up by the priests and religious of that faith which was so firmly implanted in his heart, that the soul of the good and generous Patrick Power will reap the reward promised to those who die in the true faith in the midst of good works.

Halifax, March 2.—The late Patrick Power, ex-M. P., left the following charitable bequests:—\$1,000 to the Pope or his successor, \$1,000 to

Sisters of Charity, for the support of orphans; \$5,000 to the St. Vincent de Paul Society, for the relief of Catholic poor; the income of another \$5,000 for the purchase of fuel for the poor, irrespective of creed; £50 sterling to the Convent of Mercy, at Kilmart Thomas, county of Waterford, Ireland; \$200 a year each to L. G. Power and Miss Power, for three years, to be expended in charity. After the other bequests the residue of his estate is to be applied to establishing an orphanage and reformatory for Catholic boys, to aid in the introduction of the Jesuit Fathers into Halifax. He leaves his wife \$1,600 a year, and the residence on South Park street for life. His son, L. M. Power, is left the income of \$50,000 as follows:—First year, \$500; second year, \$1,000; third year, \$1,500, and thereafter the income of the whole amount. Twenty-five thousand dollars are left to his daughter Mary under similar conditions, and \$12,000 to his daughter Ellie C., a religious of the Sacred Heart. There are several bequests of \$200 to relatives and old friends.

INJUSTICE TO THE REDMAN.

Secretary Schurz, of the American national administration, has done the Indians under his charge many grievous acts of injustice. His crowning act of injustice was his removal of the Ponca tribe from its own territory to the Indian country, without compensation, and against their interests. The settlement by a white population of the territory of Dakota should not drive a powerful government into acts of injustice towards a weak and helpless race. If the Secretary of the Interior counted on American sympathy in his course in this matter, he has evidently reckoned without his host. The American press and people have dealt severely with this act of wanton cruelty. The defence of the Secretary, has, if anything, placed him in a worse position than ever. An able and humane writer thus discusses Mr. Schurz and his dealings with the Indians:

"As a special pleader, Secretary Schurz has recognized talent. Whether he is attacking another or defending himself, he can make it appear to those who take the facts he selects and his presentation of them that there is but one side to any question; but there are abundant reasons for the judgment that he is a most dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Ponca case he has been guilty of a series of out making independent investigation of the subject. When he is right, he is a powerful advocate; when he is wrong, as he is more frequently than his blind admirers are willing to confess, he is a dangerous man to his friends. In the Pon