

## THE TRUE WITNESS

IS PUBLISHED BY  
The Post Printing & Publishing Company,  
761 CRAIG ST., Montreal, Canada.

Subscription, per annum.....\$1.50  
If paid strictly in advance.....\$1.00

TO ADVERTISERS.  
A limited number of advertisements of approved character, will be inserted in THE TRUE WITNESS, for the per line (space), first insertion, 10 per line each subsequent insertion, 5 per line. Special rates for Teachers, Information Wanted, etc., 500 per insertion (not to exceed 10 lines). Ordinary notices of Births, Deaths and Marriages 500 each insertion.

The large and increasing circulation of THE TRUE WITNESS makes it the very best advertising medium in Canada.  
NOTICE TO SUBSCRIBERS.  
Subscribers in the country should always give the name of their Post Office. Those who remove should give the name of the old as well as the new Post Office.  
Remittances can be safely made by Registered Letter or Post Office Order. All remittances will be acknowledged by changing the date on the address label attached to paper. Subscribers will see by the date on the address label when their subscription expires.  
Sample copies sent free on application.  
Parties wishing to become subscribers can do so through any responsible news agent when there is none of our local agents in their locality. Address all communications to

The Post Printing & Publishing Company,  
MONTREAL, CANADA.

WEDNESDAY.....DECEMBER 5, 1883.

## CATHOLIC CALENDAR.

DECEMBER 1883.

THURSDAY 6.—St. Nicholas of Myra, Bishop and Confessor.  
FRIDAY 7.—St. Ambrose, Bishop, Confessor, and Doctor of the Church. Fast.  
SATURDAY 8.—Immaculate Conception of the B. V. M. Holiday of Obligation. Leas. Prev. vill. 22-36; Gosp. Luke i. 26-38. Council of Vatican opened, 1869.  
SUNDAY 9.—Second Sunday in Advent. Epist. Rom. xv. 4-13; Gosp. Matt. xi. 2-10.  
MONDAY 10.—On the Octave of the Immaculate Conception.  
TUESDAY 11.—St. Damasus, Pope and Confessor.  
WEDNESDAY 12.—On the Octave.

A NUMBER of magistrates in Ireland have announced their intention of resigning in consequence of the suspension of the Orange Lord Rossmore by the British Government. The country would be left immeasurably by their resignation. They can't go too soon.

"Oma," the famous novelty, is said to be making preparations to embrace the Catholic faith. She attributes her conversion to the fact of having listened to a sermon by Mgr. Capel in Florence last winter. "Oma" is willing to make a public confession of the Catholic faith.

The London Times has, at last, had to acknowledge that Mr. Errington, the English representative at the Vatican, is not empowered to negotiate in behalf of the Irish prelates; and, what is more, says that many American bishops at Rome strongly oppose the renegade's efforts to obtain from the Vatican further condemnation of the Irish political movement. Errington's usefulness as a diplomatic discover is decidedly gone.

The Mormon missionaries are meeting with such success in England that it has been found necessary to establish an anti-Mormon league, with headquarters in London. An appeal has been forwarded to Mr. Gladstone to order the prosecution of the Mormon missionaries in order to prevent the inveigling of English youth to Salt Lake City, but the Premier has declined to interfere, presuming that the convert go of their own free will.

Poor Lord Rossmore! he has been knocked out of his high horse clean into the gutter, and that by his ungrateful masters, the English Government. Rossmore has received a reply to his letter, in which he protested against his suspension from the functions of Justice of the Peace, on account of ruffianly and riotous behavior, from the Commissioners of the Privy Seal, who say that "they regard his action as utterly subversive of the public peace." It is to be hoped that Orange men will, in the future, learn not to mistake fanaticism for loyalty, crime for virtue, and murderous violence towards fellow countrymen for patriotic warfare.

A soon point was recently made by Sir Charles Dilke against Lord Salisbury in discussing the redistribution of seats. One of the Tory pretensions is that the redistribution of seats must not be based on "mere numbers." Sir Charles Dilke said certainly not, but neither should the redistribution be based on the mere absence of numbers. The Lords have a special liking for boroughs that they can carry in their pockets; for it is easier to buy and bribe a few hundred electors than to make bribery effective among twenty or thirty thousand. That is the secret of Lord Salisbury's objection to a redistribution of seats based on mere numbers.

For some reason or other the Daily Witness occasionally sets up a furious barking against the Jesuits. Of course no one expects any injury to come of it to the Society, but it does seem ludicrous on the part of a journal like the Witness to pursue with unreasonable and unprofitable clamor a body of men whom the rest of the community has learned to esteem and respect, if not to admire. The barking of the Witness against the Jesuits puts us in mind of the dog howling at the moon. The heavenly orb is not disturbed thereby, but continues to shine all the same; so with the Jesuits, silly clamor does not affect them, but only prompts them to lift up their heads in sacrifice and devotion for the benefit of enemies as well as friends.

The election in the County of Lennox for the vacant seat in the House of Commons

has resulted in a victory for the Liberal party. The result is a gain for the opposition as the constituency was represented by Sir John Macdonald who was unseated for bribery by agents. The Reform and successful candidate was D. W. Allison and the Conservative candidate was M. W. Froy; the majority was five votes. At the general election in 1882 Sir John Macdonald defeated Mr. Allison by 250 majority, while Sir Richard Cartwright, who was the Liberal candidate in 1878, was also defeated by a majority of 59; so that Mr. Allison's present victory is greater and more significant than the actual result of a majority of five, would, at first, seem to indicate.

The manner in which the number of divorces is multiplying in the United States is astounding, and gives abundant cause for alarm. At a meeting in Philadelphia, the following statistics were given to show the dangerous popularity of the divorce system. It appears New England granted 2,113 divorces in the year 1878, Maine 587 in 1880, Rhode Island 271, and New Hampshire 314 in 1882. In the three latter States there has been of late one divorce to every ten marriages. In four of the New England States, where 726 divorces were granted in 1860, there were 1,109 in 1870 and 1,439 in 1878. Philadelphia reported 101 divorces in 1862, 215 in 1872, and 477 in 1882. The ratio of divorces to marriages in Ohio rose from 1 to 26 in 1865 to 1 to 27 in 1881. In Minnesota the two most populous counties increased their divorces in ten years 50 per cent. faster than their marriages. The ratio to marriages in Chicago, Louisville, Connecticut, and twenty-four counties in Michigan is about 1 to 13. In San Francisco and in the counties of a number of States it has been 1 to 6.

Too much "loyalty," even in an Orange man, does not pay; at least such has been the experience of Lord Rossmore, the Orange Grand Master in the North of Ireland. This gentleman (?) had incited his rowdy apprentices boys to acts of ruffianism and of bloodshed. His conduct was denounced not only by the representatives of the Irish people, but by the Liberal portion of the English press. The attention of Earl Spencer was repeatedly called to the outrageous violations of the law by his Lord Rossmore and his gang, but no inclination to prosecute the Orange assassins and disturbers of the peace, was manifested by the officials of Dublin Castle. But, now, the English authorities have interfered, and the Lords Commissioners of the Great Seal have charged Lord Rossmore with endangering the public peace by leading riotous processions despite the remonstrance of the authorities. If such a charge was brought against a Nationalist, he would be clapped into jail and finally end his days on the scaffold or in a cell, but Lord Rossmore escapes with a stiff reprimand, and a suspension of his commission as Justice of Peace in the County of Monaghan. To have forced the Government to take even this half-hearted action, and to lift its finger against the loyal pretensions of the Orange supporters of the crown and of the union, is a victory of which the Nationalists may well feel satisfied.

On Monday last we had occasion to translate and reproduce in the columns of THE POST and TRUE WITNESS an article on "Irish Affairs" from our esteemed contemporary L'Etendard. We erroneously attributed the article, which was as flattering as it was sympathetic, to the pen of Mr. Charles Thibault; it was the production of a regular member of the staff of L'Etendard, who is specially charged with "Irish Affairs." Our contemporary values our appreciation of its article all the more as it considers "THE POST" to be the best authority on such matters." Among our many French correspondents, L'Etendard stands prominently forward as a journal that seeks to discuss the Irish question from an intelligent, unbiased and honest standpoint of view, and then to embrace the side on which right and justice are to be found. Our contemporary says:—"We shall continue to closely follow the 'Irish question,' and to give our entire sympathy to noble Ireland in the gigantic contest which she is at present carrying on to obtain a full justice at the hands of England."

## TORONTO'S WIFE-BEATERS.

Toronto is becoming notorious for the number of wife-beaters it raises and harbors, at least the agent of the Associated Press makes it appear so, as the principal item of news which he sends over the wires generally concerns a squad of wife-beaters brought up at the Police Court. And another remarkable feature of the case is the extreme leniency which these brutes meet with at the hands of the Justices of the Queen's City. Yesterday, for instance, four wife-beaters were arraigned. The first one was discharged, presumably because he did not come near enough to killing his better-half. The second woman-kicker was let off with a fine of two dollars for the amount of slugging and sole leather he got in on his better half. The pugilistic exploits of the third did not cost him so much as a cent, the humane judge having simply granted a protection order in favor of the bruised and ill-treated wife. The fourth did not fare so well; the thing was getting monotonous, and for the sake of variety the Justice calculated the wounds and disfigurement of the fourth victim to be worth a fine of \$40 and a promise not to beat the unfortunate wife during the next twelve months. Toronto's record of wife-beaters is becoming quite dishonorable, but the manner in which their brutality is punished, or rather condoned, is a scandal to the community in general and a crying injustice to the weaker sex in particular. We

don't see why wife-beaters are not given a taste of the lash. If anybody deserves it, it is a brute that will pound and kick a fragile wife and leave her more dead than alive from his fiendish treatment.

## OTTAWA GOES BEGGING.

It was the general impression that the establishment of the Federal Government at Ottawa was the making of that city, but it now appears it was only a delusion. Instead of Ottawa deriving any advantage from the presence of the Government, it is, we are told, the Government that enjoys many advantages at the expense of the city. In fact the good people of Ottawa and their City Council are crying out that ruin stalks them in the face, and that bankruptcy is near at hand, all on account of the Government. They say that additional expense is incurred by the Corporation in endeavoring to maintain the city as a fit place for the seat of Government; but they seem to forget that they would have nothing but a village to maintain if the Government had pitched its tent elsewhere. If anything, Ottawa ought to pay the Government a bonus for putting up its buildings there; just as many another town pays a bonus to manufacturers for the establishment of a factory within its limits, and then exempts their property from taxation for a period of 99 years or less. That the citizens of Ottawa are serious in their efforts to dip their hands in the Federal treasury is evidenced by the fact that a deputation from the City Council has waited upon a committee of the Privy Council for the purpose of urging an annual Government grant towards the Civic Department. This deputation explained that the revenues of the city had been greatly reduced by the large quantity of land expropriated by the Government, and that the taxes had been diminished by the expropriation of the land for the site of the new parliament buildings; by the geological museum; militia stores building; the rifle range and other property, and also the civil service incomes. The depreciation of the revenue by the foregoing causes amounted to about \$25,000 annually. The Council therefore thought it should demand an annual grant equivalent to this amount. If that is not a piece of civic presumption, we do not know what is. It is stated that the Committee of the Privy Council, composed of Sir Hector Langevin, Hon. Messrs. Bowell and McLean, have promised to give the deputation's representations an earnest consideration. It is to be hoped that the Federal authorities will not be fooled into supporting civic corporations, especially one that already owes so much to the Government.

## WAR BETWEEN FRANCE AND CHINA.

The latest advices from Europe seem to point to the fact that France and China mean war beyond doubt. The war cloud in the Chinese seas grows blacker, and a formal and final declaration of open hostilities may be expected at any moment. The circular letter to the Powers sent out by China, is quiet and dignified in tone. It rehearses the general causes of provocation to war, points out that France is the aggressor, while the Chinese government made concessions in the hope of amicably adjusting their relations, but experienced only bad faith on the part of the French. The circular contains the Chinese ultimatum, that if France invades Northern Annam, where Chinese troops are stationed, war is inevitable. To avert bloodshed China appeals to the traditions of honor and loyalty cherished by France; and it expresses the regret China would feel if events forced her to make her rights respected. The Powers are called upon to bear witness as to the merits of the struggle. There is little doubt that in this matter China is on the right side. Wishing to emulate the British methods of extending the limits of the empire, France is pursuing a policy of aggression and looks to the establishment of French ascendancy in and around China upon the same principle that the Indian Empire of Great Britain was called into existence. But it is a question whether the French are not ill-prepared for the kind of conflict they are going into. China has learned a good deal of the art of war since her guns were last levelled at the "barbarians," and a contest with her now will be much less child's play than it was in 1860, when the Peking forts crumbled away beneath the combined fire of English and French. In France the Ministry are endeavoring to make the people believe that the French troops would have an easy and profitable conquest. But well-informed writers and politicians are much averse to war and are unsparring in denunciation of Mr. Ferry and his Cabinet. They hold that European complications make it necessary for France to keep all the forces at home, as in an international sense the situation in France is very precarious, requiring careful statesmanship, with conciliation and peace as the watchword. It is, moreover, very likely that China, standing as firmly as it does against French aggressions even to an acceptance of the gage of battle, is receiving encouragement from European Powers unfriendly to France. In fact, it is quite probable that Germany and England have an understanding on the subject, and that upon some small provocation they will openly assist the Chinese. The Chinese Government have been preparing for this conflict with unusual vigor and with greater intelligence than they ever displayed before. Their forces are supplied with funds and munitions of war to an unlimited extent. Large quantities of modern arms have been quietly purchased in Germany and the United States. Then the troops known as the "Black Flags" are

thoroughly organized and in good fighting condition, while reserve forces are being rapidly armed and disciplined. China can raise an enormous army, and France will have to get her invading troops up to 100,000 before they can successfully cope with the force China can bring into the field. The Chinese will not, of course, be so well prepared to resist the naval operations of their enemies, as their navy is neither strong nor complete, but they have learned something about torpedoes as a means of defense, and these they are prepared to use. On the whole, France seems to be inviting a war, which will, undoubtedly, prove longer and more expensive than she now expects, and which can produce no results that will repay her for her trouble, expenditure, and loss of life.

## EMIGRANT KIDNAPPERS FOILED.

Lord Derby, a Cabinet Minister, recently told a large English audience that no money could be better expended by England than money spent in sending the Irish people out of Ireland. The British ideal would be an Ireland altogether denuded of inhabitants and made a cattle ranch for the benefit of the landlords. The English ruling classes seem to incline more and more to the idea that Ireland's submission to misrule is dependent on the expatriation of the race. It was only the other week that the Government was caught hatching out an emigration plot, which stands without a parallel both for the dimensions which it was to assume and minuteness of detail with which it was to be carried out. The manner in which this gigantic and complete scheme for the sweeping deportation of the people was to be accomplished is contained in a document marked "Confidential Circular," a copy of which fell into the hands of the Freeman's Journal and was brought to light in its columns. There was to be a bureau of emigration in the Local Government Department with a chief official a staff of clerks, a troop of local inspectors, a brigade of agents at home and a regiment of agents abroad. Boards of Guardians were to be offered all facilities by advances of money and licences to loan money to help in emigrating families out of the several Unions. Even the clerks of Unions were to be pressed into the service, and to spur them on in their efforts to secure recruits a remuneration was offered on the following scale: 5s a head for every emigrant up to 100; 2s a head for every additional emigrant from 100 up to 1,000, after which the payment should be 1s a head. This puts us in mind of the good old times when a price was put upon an Irishman's head. We don't know of any other civilized government that puts a premium on the extinction of its subjects. Truly England has much to be ashamed of and much to be cured for in her rule of the Irish people. After setting forth the above scale of prices for the kidnapping of the Irish peasants, the "Circular" naively adds: "By this means we believe that the Union officers will take more interest in the operations of emigration." Having made of the Union officers so many emigrant kidnapers, the scheme develops into contracts with the shipping companies. "We think it would be advisable, if it were possible to do so, to invite the principal shipping companies to send in tenders of cost of ocean passage. The tenders might be asked for in December." Next there is a suggestion that to increase the facilities to send the poor people away, "the ocean steamer should come into some harbor, other than a regular port of embarkation, to take away the emigrants from the various neighboring unions." In another paragraph the formation of "local emigration committees independent of boards of guardians" is advocated, such as those that worked "in so satisfactory a way," notice the commissioners, at Ardfer and in Killarney.

The people were to be booked to Quebec. The best bone and sinew of the land, the wealth producers of the country were the only ones eligible for deportation to Canada, for the benefit of the Canadian Pacific Syndicate. Ever on the alert, the National Press and the Hierarchy of Ireland have set their foot on the unholy scheme and a voice of warning and of protest has been echoed throughout the length and breadth of the Island. "If," asks the Freeman, "as has been calculated, each emigrant is worth as he stands, without goods or chattels, 1,000 dollars to the new land which he enters, of how many thousands million dollars has Ireland been despoiled since 1841? Eusebia openly condemns her political irreconcilables to Siberian wilds, and calls it punishment. England would send her disaffected subjects to a similar Siberia, and calls it philanthropy. Better the open foe than this d—d good-natured friendship, killing a people with kindness."

Even the Orange and anti-Irish Dublin Mail emphatically condemns the plan of governing a country by driving or coaxing the people out of it. It says that "if the Government think to abate the unpopularity by exporting a quantity of live discontent to the Arctic regions they must be laboring under one of those mental delusions which Providence is said to send before destruction. Outside the precincts of Dublin Castle there are not a hundred Irishmen who believe in State emigration as a cure for the evils of the country. To parody Dr. Johnson's definition of patriotism, we may define emigration as the last resource of the incompetent statesman. The millions who have already been driven from our shores have multiplied into a nation which gives a hostile bias to the

policy of America, and may one day involve England in a fratricidal war with that formidable power. From no quarter of the globe do we hear of a body of Irishmen expressing any loyalty to the British Crown, or any concern for the welfare of the British Empire. *Caelum non animum mutant* may be affirmed with special truth of the exasperated Irish race."

But it is from the Hierarchy that the most indignant remonstrance is offered to this policy of depletion and expatriation by the British Government. They have raised their pastoral voices in solemn protest against the pernicious scheme. The Most Rev. Dr. McEvilly, Archbishop of Tuam, in council assembled with the pastors of his diocese, drew up the following resolution and gave it the widest circulation. It reads: "That we, the Archbishop and priests of the deanery of Tuam, in conference assembled, do pledge ourselves to make every legal and constitutional effort to resist the latest desperate attempt (as reported in the public press) on the part of the Government to depopulate the country by a system of subsidized emigration, which finds no parallel in any civilized country; that we deprecate in the strongest manner the attempts, as unworthy of any Government having the interests of the people and the prosperity of the country at heart; and that we hereby call upon the representatives of the Irish nation to raise their voices in emphatic protest against such conduct in their places in the House of Commons, and to give every constitutional opposition to such an anti-national and impolitic movement."

The bishops and the clergy, ever faithful and ever vigilant, will no doubt be as practical as they are plain of speech. They can be depended upon to put forth every effort to keep their flocks at home and to checkmate a "philanthropy" which would lay bare a fertile country and exile a people to virgin snows and perils. The National League will also aid in defeating the object of the Government. The leaders have strongly urged upon the League the necessity of organizing a popular movement to counteract the efforts of Secretary Trevelyan and his cohorts. The discovery of the plot has caused such a storm of indignation to burst over the heads of the Government, that it has been found necessary to withdraw the scheme and saddle the responsibility of it upon a few obscure officials. Under Secretary Hamilton was accordingly instructed to write to Archbishop McEvilly and assure his Grace that no harm was meant, and that the "confidential circular" did not emanate from the Government. This attempt to explain away "the difficulty" did not alter the fact that the plot was under the hatching process, and was fully known to the Government. It is satisfactory to know and chronicle that the scheme has been foiled, and that these emigrant kidnapers have been foiled in their detestable project by that vigilance which is ever the price of liberty. John Stuart Mill once said that "when the inhabitants of a country quit the country en masse because its government will not make it a place fit for them to live in, the government is judged and condemned." That is England's position to-day—her government stands judged and condemned.

## A VERDICT OF WILFUL MURDER AGAINST O'DONNELL.

The trial of Patrick O'Donnell, for the killing of James Carey, was brought to a speedy close on Saturday evening. The prisoner, was never looked upon as a ordinary murderer; and as a consequence, he had the sympathy of the many, the admiration of the few, and the abhorrence of none. His act was one for which the world was not inclined to demand a very heavy atonement but which must be expiated on the scaffold to satisfy the peculiar exactions of British justice. The prosecution charged that O'Donnell had killed Carey with malice aforethought, and that he was guilty of murder. The prisoner contended that he shot the informer in self-defense, and on the spot without any previous meditation. The question then is, did the Crown prove the fact that Carey's death was the result of an act prompted by malice *premeditated*? We do not think it did. The only eye witness who was supposed to have viewed the fatal quarrel on board ship from beginning to end, was Carey's young son. This lad's testimony in the box was so contradictory that the Judge was forced to confess that the youth was decidedly "untruthful," and that his evidence could not be relied on. What was the cause of young Carey's failure to testify in a direct and straightforward manner that O'Donnell had shot his father without any provocation on the part of the latter? Evidence to that effect and of that description would have justified a jury in coming to the conclusion that O'Donnell's act was premeditated and was born of malice; but the utter absence of such evidence from the only witness who could and ought to know, should have left a reasonable doubt, at least, in the minds of the jury as to any malice aforethought in connection with the affair. If the principal witness of the Crown, and the only one who saw the first and last of the affair, could not swear to the facts and the circumstances that would have proved the killing to have been premeditated, then the jury violated the first principle of justice in accepting and believing what the Crown itself was unable to prove or make evident.

The verdict of guilty which the jury rendered against O'Donnell was consequently based either on ignorance or on prejudice. That the jury was composed of men who were not very enlightened may be gathered from the following incidents. The jury, after having been looked up for some time, returned to

ask the Court "If a man had a deadly weapon in his hand, and another thought that he was about to use it against him and shot the former, would it be manslaughter or murder?" There must not have been much intelligence among the twelve if they could not answer that question themselves. But to make matters worse, the Judge, instead of affording the requisite information answered the question by asking another which was highly suggestive of partiality. The Judge asked, "Where was the evidence of any act done by Carey which induced O'Donnell to think Carey meant to shoot him?" The object of that question was to throw discredit on the evidence of the defence and to make the jury disbelieve it. Why did not the Bench ask, "Where was the evidence that Carey did not induce O'Donnell to think Carey meant to shoot him?" This question would have been more in accordance with impartiality and justice. Another incident illustrative of the jury's ignorance arose when they asked what was the meaning of "malice aforethought." Now, we submit that to place the life of a fellow creature in the hands of men who do not know the meaning of the words which constitute the first elements of a capital crime, and to make his existence dependent on their judgment and decision, is a crying shame and injustice; it is a scandalous trifling with life and liberty. It is to be feared that the jury allowed themselves to be swayed by prejudice and by the thought that the Crown expected them to do their duty in the matter, which could be accomplished, only, by bringing in a verdict of guilty. There is one thing certain, that there will be much less justice in the hanging of O'Donnell than there ever was in the killing of Carey.

## "AMERICAN CATHOLICS AND THE PAPACY."

Our evening contemporary, the Star, has undertaken to discuss a subject which is decidedly beyond its ken. It may be quite able to debate the merits of the "Gas character," but our confere is by no means competent to discourse on the "relations between the Papacy and American Catholics." Its article on this subject is brimful of errors and absurdities, which could spring only from a false conception and a very imperfect knowledge of what the writer undertook to treat in an all-wise manner. A brief analysis of our contemporary's article will amply demonstrate the consummate ignorance which characterizes each and every sentence. It begins by saying:

"We are by no means sure that, in the relations between the Papacy and the adherents of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, there are not the elements of a difficulty which may yet prove serious. It was announced from Rome the other day that the American bishops assembled there were standing out for a large measure of what may be called 'home rule' for the Church in the United States. His Holiness, on the other hand, desired, it was stated, to bind the American Church more closely to the Church in general, and to move in the direction rather of increased centralization."

What does the writer mean to convey by saying that the Church in the United States wants a larger measure of "home rule," and that Rome desires "increased centralization"? The sentence is high sounding, but it is absolutely meaningless. It is absurd to apply terms used in political strife to the mode of government exercised by the Holy See over the Universal Church or any part thereof. The idea which is sought to be expressed is preposterous. There is no such thing as "home rule" for any portion of the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church is the same in Montreal as in New York, the same in South America as in Europe. There can be no divisions in its interests and no multiplication of its objects, for it is one and indivisible. Consequently no portion or section thereof can demand any "measure of home rule;" and as a further deduction there can be no desire on the part of the Holy See for "increased centralization." The laws which govern the Church in Rome are the same that govern the Church in any part of the civilized or uncivilized globe. There may be variations in the regulations regarding the details of discipline as for instance certain days in the year may be days of fast in one diocese and not in another; a certain feast may be a holy day of obligation in one country and not in another; but even these slight differences are not the result of any "Home Rule power" exercised by individual bishops. The power and authority that make the fast obligatory on certain days in a certain diocese, are the same that grant a dispensation from it to the Catholic of another diocese, and they are the power and authority of the Holy See.

The absurdity of the Star making the American bishops assume an unwarrantable attitude of opposition to the Pope on the question of notorious "Home Rule" is, accordingly, quite plain. There are not the slightest grounds upon which to base even a doubt that "in the relations between the Papacy and American Catholics there are not the elements of a difficulty which may yet prove serious." Our contemporary goes on to say:—

"We learn more recently that His Holiness is determined to repress certain abuses which have crept into the churches in the United States as regards the management of their financial affairs. . . . The object is laudable, but the question is: Will the churches of the United States submit to be governed as are these of Spain, Italy, France and Belgium? Is not national feeling in the United States too strong?"

In the first place, it is not His Holiness who is determined to repress what is called certain abuses in the financial affairs of the Church. It is the American bishops themselves that have laid the question before the Holy See, as they have done all others. The