

**The Catholic Record**  
Published Weekly at 408 Richmond Street,  
London, Ontario.  
REV. JOHN F. COFFEY, M.A., Editor.  
THOS. COFFEY, Publisher & Proprietor.

General Agents:  
Messrs. Donohoe 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  
advance.

Advertising rates made known on appli-  
cation.  
Approved by the Bishop of London, and  
recommended by the Bishops of Ottawa,  
Kingston, and Peterboro, and leading Cath-  
olic Clergymen throughout the Dominion.  
All correspondence addressed to the Pub-  
lisher will receive prompt attention.  
Advertisers 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, OCT. 18, 1884.

#### AN IMPOSSIBLE ALLIANCE.

Some weeks ago a National League meeting was held at Castletown, in the county of Down, at which the chief speakers were William O'Brien, M. P., and Michael Davitt. Mr. Davitt, we are told, treated his hearers to a genuine surprise. He declared himself second in command of a political army invading Ulster with a fixed purpose and a well-founded expectation of victory. The Nationalists had, in his opinion, one great and absorbing desire, as far as the Northern province was concerned, and that was for political unity between the Orangemen and Catholics. Mr. Davitt begged his hearers, who were mainly Catholics, to lay aside their religious differences of opinion for the sake of the patriotic duty which is incumbent alike on the Catholic and the Orangeman. "Let religion," he said, "give way once for patriotism, and then only we shall get home rule for Ireland." The audience, almost entirely, as we have said, Catholic in its composition, was taken altogether by surprise at these outspoken advances towards the friendship of the Orangemen. We are not surprised that if a few raised a cheer for Davitt and union, most of them stood transfixed with amazement. A contemporary, dealing with the extraordinary speech of the apostle of land nationalization, says:

"Two inferences are drawn from this episode at Castletown. The first is that Messrs. Davitt and Parnell have settled their differences, and that the former is once more the trusted lieutenant and mouthpiece of his chief. The second conclusion is that the Parnellites have determined upon a new line of tactics in seeking a coalition with the Orangemen, in order, by their aid, to defeat the Conservatives at the next general election. It is not believed that the Orangemen will ever consent to such a coalition, although it must be admitted that they have lately been exceedingly restive under Castle Government in consequence of its alleged partiality in suppressing their meetings."

We do not believe that either of these inferences are correct. Mr. Davitt is known to differ radically on certain important points from Mr. Parnell, and has given no indication whatever of bringing himself into line with the latter on these points. He still adheres as firmly as ever to his land nationalization scheme, whereby every man holding land in Ireland, England and Scotland would become tenants of the state. In a word, he would have established a Casteism, crushing out all individual initiative, and as odious, to say the least, by reason of its heartlessness, as any form of Irish landlordism. As the state is in Britain controlled by the majority for the time being, the minority were completely at the mercy of petty tyrants, acting in the name and by the authority of the state, with even more impunity than landlords' agents nowadays. Mr. Davitt in his Castletown speech would seem to cast blame on the Catholics for the disloyalty to Ireland of the Orangemen. If Orangemen be disloyal to Ireland, and we all know they are, Catholics are no less responsible for this sad state of things. The religion of Catholics is no barrier to patriotic action and to patriotic combination. They have never made it so, but the Orange faction is so imbued with hatred of the religion of the majority of Irishmen that they will have no alliance with them looking to the achievement of self-government. Mr. Davitt should certainly be aware of all this. The work of winning Home Rule for Ireland must be, and can be, achieved without the Orangemen. But, perchance, he sets the realization of his nationalization theory above the achievement of self-government for Ireland. In that case we can understand his eagerness to secure the co-operation of the Orange faction. We do not for a moment believe that Mr. Parnell has any purpose in view to secure Orange help. He must know that it cannot be had. But we do think that he will use every effort to secure the co-operation of the thousands of Irish Protestants who are not Orangemen, and who despise the methods as well as oppose the aims of that accursed body. Mr. Davitt has of late expressed some most extraordinary views in regard of the Irish land question. He has, for instance, out of his deadly hostility to the Irish Migration Company, of which Mr. Parnell is chairman, and whose purposes have met with the approval of the bishops and clergy of Ireland, expressed the view that to relieve the congested districts of

Ireland by purchasing lands in less crowded parts of the country and attracting small farmers to them by cheap rents and easy terms for instalment purchases, is but one step removed from State-aided emigration, and that in some respects it is quite as objectionable. The Irish, he says, are not only patriotic in their love for their country as a whole, but they are also devoted to their native counties, towns, and villages. To transplant a Donegal man to Kerry or a Corkonian to Tyrone, to send Mayo farmers to Meath, and Louth families to Galway, is only a shade better than shipping them off to America. Mr. Davitt also complains of the prices which Mr. Parnell's company is paying the present landlords for estates which they could not possibly sell to any one else at any figure.

No wonder, say we, that earnest patriots like Mr. Biggar have broken off all connection with Mr. Davitt. "There is one thing," said the former, a few weeks ago, "I object to. Mr. Davitt implies that he alone is the advocate of the doctrine of the land for the people, and that I am its opponent. The contrary is the fact. I would give the land, the very acres, to the tenants for their own, whereas Mr. Davitt would vest it all in the Government. On Mr. Davitt's plan the tenant would be merely transferred from one landlord to another, and Ireland would be given in fee simple to England."

Mr. Davitt may secure Orange support for this pet scheme, but he can never bring Orangemen into line to co-operate with their Catholic fellow-countrymen in the efforts of the latter to secure for their country the lasting and unspeakable benefits of Home Rule.

#### HOW ODDFELLOWS ARE MADE.

A most extraordinary and certainly unusual case is now before the Courts of this Province. The other day there was tried at Whitchurch an action brought by one Richard Kniver, a chairmaker of Oshawa, against the Phoenix Lodge of Oddfellows of that town, for compensation for injuries by him received during the ceremony of initiation. The plaintiff sets forth that being a duly qualified person for admission to the Oddfellows' Society, according to the by-laws thereof, he, on the 26th of November last, submitted himself for initiation as a member of their body, and with that object in view placed himself entirely in the hands and under the control of the defendants in this case. He further states that the initiation consists of certain ceremonies, the nature of which is kept concealed from the uninitiated, and of which the plaintiff was then (as the defendants knew) ignorant, and for the purpose of which it was required by the defendants that the plaintiff should submit his person unreservedly to their hands, which he accordingly did; and during such initiation ceremonies (the said defendants being then regularly in session) the plaintiff, without any default or contributory neglect on his part, by certain of the defendants' members or officers taking part in such initiation, and duly authorized for such purpose by the defendants, was violently thrown in such a manner as to cause injury to the plaintiff's spine, from which he has since suffered, and is now suffering, beside certain minor injuries. The plaintiff has sustained loss and damage in consequence of such injuries, in being unable to work at his trade and to support his family, and in nursing, payment of money for medical advice and treatment, and is advised and believes that the effects of the injuries sustained by him may last for several years.

In reply to this statement the defendants file a plea that their constitution and by-laws required candidates for initiation to be in sound health, which the plaintiff knew. Yet, knowing that he was not in a sound physical condition he, by misrepresentation and concealment, procured his initiation. They deny the specific charges of violence preferred by the plaintiff and declare that any injuries sustained by him during his initiation were not caused by them or by any one acting under their authority. The plaintiff testified that on the evening in question he presented himself in the ante-room of the lodge and was then blindfolded. He was then conducted into the lodge-room by a person appointed for that purpose, and there a chain was placed around his body in such a way that it kept his arms above his elbows close to his body. He then received a push from behind, which caused him to fall forward over something, which caused his feet to fly up from the floor, and his head to come into violent contact with something from which it received a severe bruise. The article over which the plaintiff fell was, according to other witnesses, the stuff cover of the lodge organ, which some of those present held in front of him about knee high. Upon his falling someone asked, "Shall we have mercy?" and then someone else shouted, "Have mercy." He was then lifted up off the floor and with the chain still on led about here and there for a time. The cap and chain were then taken off him, and the Noble Grand came to the plaintiff (according to the latter's statement) and said, "I am afraid we hurt you."

The medical testimony was, as might be expected, contradictory. The "Noble Grand" in the course of his testimony,

admitted a good deal of that which the plaintiff asserted. He admitted that in the course of the ceremony the candidate is led blindfolded from one to another of four officers, each of whom delivers a charge to him:

"Meanwhile the lodge room is but very dimly lighted, and the Noble Grand sits in his chair with a screen about it, forming a little doorless chamber about six feet square, from within which (when the proper time comes) he delivers instructions to the candidate who is being initiated or who is receiving a degree. In consequence of being so situated he did not see what occurred to the plaintiff on the evening in question, but he heard an unusual noise. It was customary in conducting the initiation ceremony to lead the candidate about lither and thither with a view to bewildering or befogging him, so when the cap was removed from his head he should be unable to find the door by which he had entered the lodge room."

All of which is quite interesting indeed. We are not now, we must confess, surprised at the appellation the "Oddfellows" have given themselves. The savage horse-play in which they indulge in the initiation of members fully entitles them to it. We have no objection whatever to their retention of this singular title. The Kniver case will, we trust, have the effect of making men think twice before giving themselves over to any such body. To join a secret society is to surrender one's liberty, to subject oneself to bewildering and befogging, as the "Noble Grand" of Phoenix lodge himself puts it.

#### "THE CATHOLIC TROUBLE."

Under the above heading we lately read one of the most extraordinary articles it has ever been our lot to peruse. The article appeared in a late issue of the Baltimore Mirror. It begins by calling attention to a letter, a "very strange letter" written some months ago by the Canadian correspondent of the London Tablet, to that journal. The gist of this very strange letter was, according to the Mirror, that there existed in Canada a party of Canadian Catholics known as Ultramontanes, intent on placing the great bulk of the population outside the fold of the church. Our Baltimore contemporary then adds that it has looked for some motion on the part of its English Canadian exchanges, but they have maintained an incomprehensible silence on the subject. The silence of its English Canadian exchanges is not, we assure our friend, by any means incomprehensible, nor will he look on it as such when he learns that none of them know anything of a party, Ultramontane or otherwise, with any object such as that referred to by the Mirror.

The Mirror, however, seems to have found solace for its troubles over Canadian religious difficulties by a perusal of La Verite, a journal published not in Montreal but in Quebec. On the authority of La Verite, the Mirror proceeds to state that there has been no revolt against Canadian prelates by the Ultramontanes, but that "there has been a strong protest on the part of the true Canadian Catholics against the criminal remissness which has allowed the bulk of the Canadian French to go in disregard of the *Syllabus* and other Papal mandates, and to sink deeper into the mires of Freemasonry and secret societies."

We have never ourselves noticed in La Verite any such statement as that here attributed to it. But whether any such affirmation was or was not made by a Canadian journal, we may inform the Mirror that neither the bulk of, nor any large number of Canadian French belong to the Masonic or secret associations. There is not a man in Canada cognizant of the religious state of the Province of Quebec who will not bear us out in this contention. But let us follow the Mirror further:

"Most of the Canadian French newspapers, while pretending to be Catholic, belong to the Liberalistic school and openly preach the most detestable doctrines. The Patrie, the Electeur, the Union, the Progres, the Franco-Canadien, the Minerve, the Canadien, the Evénement, the Monde, the Quotidien, the Nord, the Progres de l'Est, while they sail under Catholic colors, are all more or less tainted by the evil theories of the day and are doing the devil's work inside the fold. They form a powerful clique: are great in talking about their rights, when their aim is to curtail the rights of the Holy See; and they have actually had the audacity, according to the Verite, to lay false evidence before the Sacred Congregation at Rome. The Archbishop of Quebec, whom they pretend to defend against the 'aggressions' of the Papists (save the mark!), has repeatedly condemned them, but, favored by some lesser ecclesiastical dignitaries, the Liberalistic Freemasons 'Catholics' maintain their attitude of defiance. The Apostolic Commission has arrived in the troubled province, and we may expect that these rebellious children of the Church will be speedily brought to book."

It is impossible not to feel amused at some of these statements. None of the papers here mentioned have ever, that we are aware of, been explicitly condemned by any Catholic bishop in the Province of Quebec. Some one, or perchance two of them, have from time to time been indirectly condemned for articles of radical tendencies, but the French press of Quebec, as a whole, is thoroughly loyal and devoted to the Holy See, and not one of the journals mentioned above has ever advocated

the curtailment of the rights of the Holy See. And it has never, we contend, been proven that any of them has ever laid false evidence before the Sacred Congregation at Rome. The fact is that a small and now fortunately powerless clique in the Province of Quebec, boasting of being Catholic, has accused the Archbishop of Quebec of doing so, and, placing itself over the heads of the venerable hierarchy of that Province, would dictate to the bishops the course they should follow in matters educational and otherwise. Would it surprise the Mirror to learn that La Verite, for instance, has fallen into disfavor with His Grace the Archbishop of Quebec, one of the most eminent and justly venerated prelates on the continent of America? Would it surprise our contemporary to know that L'Etendard, a journal of the same school as La Verite, is not in a better position in Montreal? Who are these "lesser ecclesiastical dignitaries," referred to by the Mirror? No one in this country knows them. Were the Archbishop in Canada he would, we doubt not, be prepared to testify that he has received less trouble at the hands of Liberalistic Freemason Catholics, and the lesser ecclesiastical dignitaries who stand by them, than he has at the hands of arrogant and aggressive zealots—who, no sorer than the Holy See has given decision in matters of moment to the religious world in Canada, seek to find some means of withholding obedience to its decrees. It is these who raise the cry of "false evidence" at Rome, and it is these that have troubled the church in Canada.

We will not follow the Mirror through its citation from the work of Jean D'Erbre on Freemasonry. This citation is misleading. There may be, for instance, 50 lodges of the masonic order in Quebec, with 2,840 active members. But these are not now, and never were Catholics. Freemasonry is in the eyes of French Catholics a dangerous and detestable organization. Too many indeed of them have been led into its meshes. But the bishops and clergy have made, and are making every effort to deliver these from masonic control and tyranny, and to prevent any others from following their pernicious example. There can be no harm whatever, but a great deal of good in newspapers warning Catholics against the dangers of Freemasonry. We do, however, hold that there is harm and grievous injury done by the publication of reckless statements, calculated to bring a whole race into contempt, and a noble church into disrepute abroad. The Mirror has completely misapprehended the state of things in French Canada. There religion flourishes and no evil condemned by the Holy See "flourishes, undermining the faith, and spreading far and wide like an uncurable dropping contagious poison."

"Not obliquely," says the Mirror, "but honor, to the heroic band of Catholics who are fighting the moral plague, and who insist that the Pope's mandates shall be, not a dead letter, but an active principle in Church affairs!"

If, by this heroic band, the Baltimore Mirror means the zealots, who resist the authority of bishops, insisting in season and out of season that the Pope's mandates shall be, not a dead letter, but an active principle in the Church; if, by that band, it means these stiff-necked busy-bodies, who take upon themselves to interpret after their own fashion, the mandates of the Holy See, refusing to obey them unless they accord with their own pre-conceived notions and deep-rooted prejudices, then, say we, obloquy and dishonor must be their lot.

#### THE LATE FATHER O'MAHONEY.

It is with feelings of the profoundest sorrow that we have in this issue to chronicle the death of the Rev. Father O'Mahoney, formerly of this city, but lately of Kendalltown, Wis. The sad occurrence took place on the 29th ult. As yet we are without further details. The announcement of the death of this worthy priest was no sooner made known by the daily press than the liveliest feelings of regret were felt and expressed on all sides in this city and diocese. The deceased priest was distinguished for many fine and endearing qualities: his kindness, amiability and generosity had endeared him to all who enjoyed his acquaintance, while his ability and eloquence had won him very general esteem. During his residence in London he frequently and most acceptably filled the pulpit of St. Peter's and all privileged to assist at his sermons retained a lively and profitable recollection of their brilliancy and effect. He had at the time of his death attained his thirty-ninth year only. He was born in the county of Wexford, Ireland, and during his earlier years he was employed in Waterford, where his father was the owner of a large fishing fleet. This business he relinquished and entered the church when a young man, resolved to become a "fisher of men." He began his clerical education at Carlow College, Ireland, and completed it with the Holy Cross Fathers in St. Johns, New Brunswick, immediately on coming to America. He was ordained by Bishop Sweeney at St. Johns, N. B., in 1871 and continued a member of the Holy Cross for some thirteen years. He traveled in the Mar-

time Provinces and Quebec extensively, and was a professor in Notre Dame University, South Bend, Ind., for several years. From that city he came to London in 1879, accompanied by Rev. Father Cooney, and the two conducted a mission retreat that is still well remembered by many. They performed a vast amount of mission work elsewhere throughout the London diocese. Father O'Mahoney, becoming very favorably impressed with this city, decided to make it his home, and became an assistant priest in connection with the parish, residing in the Palace. He also acted efficiently in the capacity of secretary to Bishop Walsh, showing marked ability in parochial work and management. In May, 1882, he left the city, going on a tour through the Western States collecting on behalf of the new cathedral here, but finally assumed parochial charge in the diocese of Milwaukee, where he remained until his decease, a period of about a year and a half. May he rest in peace.

#### THE C. P. R. vs. THE GRAND TRUNK.

It was, we must confess, with the greatest interest that we read the letter of the Hon. Peter Mitchell in vindication of the Canadian Pacific Railway against the attacks of Lord Claude Hamilton, M. P., a director of the Grand Trunk, on the former company. Lord Claude Hamilton, during a late visit to Ottawa, the guest of his kinsman the Marquis of Lansdowne, favored the Globe correspondent at the capital with an interview. The report of that interview, as published in the columns of the Globe, excited very general comment. Mr. Mitchell discusses the matter very fully in a three column letter to the Montreal Herald, bearing date the 27th of September, 1884. We regret that the space this week at our command absolutely forbids our going over Mr. Mitchell's argument in its entirety. We can only deal with that portion of his letter bearing on the relations between the Parliament and Government of Canada with the Canadian Pacific Railway. We were not of those who advocated the consummation of the bargain between the Canadian Pacific Syndicate and the Government of Canada, when the terms were first submitted for ratification. Nor did we view with unmixed approval the legislation of last session whereby the government of Canada came to the aid of the Canadian Pacific Company to the extent of \$30,000,000. We had always thought that the old Province of Canada was guilty of a grave dereliction of duty in not undertaking, on its own behalf, the construction of a trunk line of railway from Sarnia to Riviere du Loup. By giving over that great work, one of national necessity and importance, to a Company, the country has suffered to an extent, in our estimation, incalculable. To a portion of the loss directly suffered by the Canadian people through the construction of that line by a Company, we will refer before closing. The Canadian Pacific railway became, with the acquisition of the North-West, a work of vital national importance. The whole country called for its construction at the earliest possible period. Leading men of both political parties were all agreed on the main issue that the road should be built as soon and as fast as the resources of the country permitted. Mr. Mackenzie's administration secured for the North-West its first railway outlet by the construction of the Pembina branch, bringing Winnipeg and Manitoba into connection with the American system of railways. But great as was this boon to Canada and the North-west, our people were not satisfied. Mr. Mackenzie could not be made to undertake the building of a through all rail route on Canadian territory as a government work—a mistake which cost him the Premiership, and his party what promised to be a long tenure of office. The defeat of the Liberal administration in the fall of 1878 caused, of course, some delay in arrival at a decisive policy on this important subject. At length, in the autumn of 1880, the Canadian Pacific syndicate, largely composed of gentlemen interested in that great enterprise the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba railway, which first opened the eyes of the world to the wealth and possibilities of our great North-Western empire, made an offer to the Canadian government for the construction of the road, an offer which gave rise to prolonged discussion in the press and in Parliament. The bargain was in many respects a good one for the syndicate, in others not so good. It was then foreseen that the government should have to come to the relief of the company, as it did last session. And we may say further, that having committed itself to the construction of the road by a company and having forced on the company the construction of the main line with a rapidity unequalled for the government stood last session bound to do either one of two things—take the work off the company's hands or grant them the aid they demanded and certainly required. The Canadian Pacific company cannot and ought not to be blamed for making as good terms as they could with the government of Canada. They have not been really as highly favored by the govern-

ment of the Dominion as was the Grand Trunk by the old Province of Canada.

The gist of Lord Claude Hamilton's complaint against the Pacific railway is that the aid extended by the Canadian government to the road has been expended in the acquisition of branch lines in the Province of Ontario and Quebec. Lord Claude is thus reported in the interview:

"Unlike the Canadian Pacific the Grand Trunk could not make up its losses or replenish its exchequer by cash obtained from the Canadian Government. It was inequitable for the Dominion Government to allow the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to use the money granted by the public to build the main Pacific line in establishing a competing railway system in the older provinces. Such a thing would certainly not have been permitted in England, or even, he thought, in the United States. The Grand Trunk did not object to the construction of other railways, even with those competing with them, but they surely had cause to complain when the Government of Canada entered the lists against them, and used the public treasury to aid their rivals. The crusade of the Canadian Pacific Company against the Grand Trunk was suicidal, resulting only in injury to both."

Mr. Mitchell replies with vigor, and, we will say, with success:

"It is not for you, my lord, a Grand Trunk director, to challenge the liberality of the Canadian Government in connection with the railways of this country. You can scarcely have forgotten the fact that the road you represent is a debtor to the Canadian Government to the extent of \$25,607,393, not counting interest on this vast amount for the past ten or twelve years. Have you already forgotten that at the last session of the Canadian Parliament your Company asked to be allowed and receive permission to issue about \$70,000,000 of new bonds to take precedence of this long-standing debt? Nor is it for you to challenge the mature judgment and action of the people of Canada in deciding what railways are or are not worthy of public support. When the Grand Trunk discharges its debt to Canada, when it ceases to be a beggar at the door of Parliament for friendly legislation if not for alms, it will be time enough for its directors to assume the role of dictator and arraign the Parliament of a free country as if it were a machine to be manipulated according to Grand Trunk interests."

Mr. Mitchell emphatically denies that the money of the Canadian people has been used in the acquisition of branch lines in Ontario and Quebec. His denial is surely equal in value to the bare assertion of Lord Claude Hamilton. The member for Northumberland tells the noble lord that in the same sentence in which he unjustly denounces the government of Canada for the iniquitous proceeding of aiding to establish a competing railway line in Ontario, "a line to which there has been contributed not one dollar of the public money of Canada," he alleges that the "Grand Trunk did not object to the construction of other railways, even those competing with them."

Mr. Mitchell tells him that the statement will be read with surprise if not with indignation by Canadians, who remember how Grand Trunk influence in England drove the late Sir Hugh Allan from the English money market, when he endeavored to make sale of the bonds of the Northern Colonization railway, extending from Quebec to Montreal and Ottawa, or how, at a later date, the same fact, through the same influence, met the Treasurer of Quebec, when he visited Britain on a similar errand, or, finally, how the Grand Trunk has persistently opposed every movement to supply Canada with railway facilities which were not tributary to its interests or how, "in its latest efforts to obstruct the building of the Canadian Pacific it not only attacked the credit and character of that enterprise but went to the length of threatening the credit of the country itself in the English money market. The people of Canada, my lord, have not such convenient memories as Grand Trunk directors seem to need, as they have not forgotten who it was commenced the 'crusade,' not against the Grand Trunk but against the Canadian Pacific."

Lord Claude Hamilton has affected to treat Mr. Mitchell's letter with disdain. He considers it not usual in England to notice such productions. We cannot, indeed, state what is the course in England in such matters, nor do we care, but we must say that Mr. Mitchell's affected disdain for Mr. Mitchell's able letter does him no credit. He committed himself to certain public statements and should be prepared to prove them.

Mr. Mitchell shows that the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada is indebted to the people of Canada in several millions of dollars, and that the payment of this vast debt is a matter of the greatest doubt. Canada has lost more by the Grand Trunk than even the payment of the twenty-four millions with interest, spoken of by Mr. Mitchell, could cover. It therefore, as he says, it becomes that company, or any of its officials, to lecture the Parliament and people of Canada on their attitude towards the Canadian Pacific Railway. The company in charge of the construction of the latter have displayed an enterprise and a patriotic interest in the national progress of Canada for which they deserve all credit. No fault can or ought to be found with them if to assist them in developing the resources of Canada they have insisted, or may in the future insist, upon

the active co-

government of great work of national consolidation. The Trunk is really more alien than Canadian from London, England, east and west—Chicago, Ill., are both adian Pacific, on work that owes its energy and Canada our great national Canadians, and deal with the vast area of the world domain and Grand Trunk monopoly, which could never prospered. To Mr. exposition of the ad, Lord Claude deign to reply, shel "etiquette." The felt mortified and mere colonist shouldments. Mr. Mitchell regardless of "etic agony in a manner hearted scene of Irish had never seen Co concludes in these ous, earnest, and p rest assured that Canada is henceforth people of Canada w ed, and break the Parliament that sates seek monopol Government or by at attacking the Dominion in En means it may be fell purpose, the p both the will and themselves against spiracies to place traffic of the c of a single Corpor ment may be attac ders against our may be daily inv standing and the dian Pacific Railw target for Grand Tr pend upon it, sit, and the energy and vast resource Canadians will rise machinations of the Lord Claude Hamil ed, will see a new Dominion worthy and especially w refused to place th of an English corp change speculator cution rather than the Grand Trunk company in England.

Mr. Mitchell's echo in every Can will suffer no int affairs by strange monopoly. She l tional highway f That the construc this great highway Canada's entire deign control is the hope and the mos tions.

#### CATHOLIC EDU

We reproduce graph from the D mal of the 20th ult ing of Catholic sc in Ireland. It w most of our read His Lordship the his return from th eulogistic terms and their good w His Lordship's v generated the Freee tests.

Our Dublin cont "We publish to those students at animation who honours and prize be recognised w that, as usual, the leges and school running. The p by a student of Belfast, Master J. our hearty congr Ulsterman and shares his proud other eminent Stanislaus," Tullend who fills th of the year, and prominence are the various Cath throughout the tain Brothers, a well to the fr tribute to their educational large number of have carried a grades has been dents. St. Mal the Senior, the the Middle, Academical In Junior. The Sch Alexandra Scho places of the g the second pla we are gratified a pupil of St. L In the more p jects, as, for ex the economy, s the convents, c financial results £2,000 more t distributed. O cent, has fallor £1,889, or 37 p