

The Catholic Record
Published Weekly at 408 Richmond Street,
London, Ontario.

General Agents:
Messrs. Donald Groves and Luke King,
Ottawa Agency:
P. J. Coffey, Gen'l Agent, 74 George St.

Approved by the Bishop of London, and
recommended by the Bishops of Ottawa,
Kingston, and Peterboro, and leading Catho-
lic Clergymen throughout the Dominion.

Catholic Record.
LONDON, SATURDAY, OCT. 18, 1884.

AN IMPOSSIBLE ALLIANCE.

Some weeks ago a National League
meeting was held at Castletellan, in the
county of Down, at which the chief speak-
ers were William O'Brien, M. P., and
Michael Davitt. Mr. Davitt, we are told,

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 con-
cerned, and that was for political unity
between the Orangemen and Catholics.

"Two inferences are drawn from this
episode at Castletellan. 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 con-
clusion is that the Parnellites have deter-
mined upon a new line of tactics in seek-
ing a coalition with the Orangemen, in
order, by their aid, to defeat the Conser-
vatives 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 im-
portant 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 Ire-
land, 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
Castletellan speech would seem to cast
blame on the Catholics for the disloyalty to
Ireland of the Orangemen. If Orange-
men be disloyal to Ireland, and we all
know they are, Catholics are no more
responsible for this sad state of things.
The religion of Catholics is no barrier to
patriotic action and to patriotic combi-
nation. 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 cer-
tainly be aware of all this. The work of
winning Home Rule for Ireland must be,
and can be, achieved without the Orange-
men. But, perchance, he sets the realization
of his nationalization theory above the
achievement of self-government for Ire-
land. 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 Orange-
men, 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 attract-
ing 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 Don-
egal man to Kerry or a Corkonian to
Tyronne, 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 con-
tact with Mr. Davitt. "There is one
thing," said the former, a few weeks ago,
"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 bene-
fits of Home Rule.

HOW ODDFELLOWS ARE MADE.

A most extraordinary and certainly un-
usual case is now before the Courts of
this Province. The other day there was
tried at Whitty 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 admis-
sion to the Oddfellows' Society, according
to the by-laws thereof, he, on the 26th of
November last, submitted himself for initia-
tion as a member of their body, and
with that object in view placed himself
entirely in the hands and under the con-
trol 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 de-
fendants knew) ignorant, and for the pur-
pose of which it was required by the de-
fendants that the plaintiff should submit
his person unreservedly to their hands,
which he accordingly did; and during
such initiation ceremonies (the said de-
fendants being then regularly in session)
the plaintiff, without any default or contri-
butionary neglect on his part, by certain de-
fendants' members or officers taking part
in such initiation, and duly authorized for
such purpose by 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 plain-
tiff has sustained loss and damage in con-
sequence 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 misrepresen-
tation 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 him-
self 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 be-
hind, 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
he 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 state-
ment) 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, form-
ing 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 initi-
ated 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 con-
ducting 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, sur-
prised at the appellation the "Oddfellows"
have given themselves. The savage horse-
play in which they indulge in the initia-
tion 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 CANADIAN 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 Bal-
timore Mirror. It begins by calling at-
tention 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 Mir-
ror, that there existed in Canada a party
of Canadian Catholics known as Ultra-
montanes, 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 Cana-
dian exchanges, but they have maintained
an incomprehensible silence on the sub-
ject. 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 Cana-
dian religious difficulties by a perusal of
La Verite, a journal published not in
Montreal but in Quebec. On the author-
ity 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 Catho-
lics 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 mire 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 news-
papers, while pretending to be Catholic,
belong to the Liberalistic school and
openly preach the most detestable doc-
trines. The Patrie, the Electeur, the
Union, the Progres, the Franco-Canadian,
the Minerve, the Canadien, the Eevening
the Monde, the Quotidien, the Nord,
the Progres de l'Est, while they sail
under Catholic colors, are all more or less
fructured by the evil theories of the day
and are doing the devil's work inside the
fold. They form a powerful clique: are
fringed 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 Con-
gregation at Rome. The Archbishop of
Quebec, whom they pretend to defend
against the 'aggressions' of the Papists
(save the mark!), has repeatedly con-
demned them, but, favored by some lesser
ecclesiastical dignitaries, the Liberalistic
Freemason Catholics maintain their
attitude of defiance. The Apostolic Com-
missary 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 jour-
nals 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 Con-
gregation 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 sur-
prise 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 coun-
try knows them. Were the Archbishop
in Canada he would, we doubt not, be pre-
pared to testify that he has received less
trouble at the hands of liberalistic free-
mason Catholics, and the lesser ecclesiasti-
cal dignitaries who stand by them, than
he has at the hands of arrogant and ag-
gressive 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'Erbee on freemasonry. This citation
is misleading. There may be, for instance,
59 lodges of the masonic order in Quebec,
with 2,840 active members. But the
overwhelming majority of these are not
now, and never were Catholics. Free-
masonry 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 pre-
vent any others from following their pe-
nurious example. There can be no harm
whatever, but a great deal of good in news-
papers warning Catholics against the dan-
gers of Freemasonry. We do, however,
hold that there is harm and grievous in-
jury 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 upstee tree dropping contagious poison."
"Not obduracy," 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 prin-
ciple in Church affairs!"

If, by this heroic band, the Baltimore Mir-
ror means the zealots, who resist the author-
ity of bishops, insisting in season and out
of season that the Pope's mandates shall
be, not a dead letter, but an active prin-
ciple 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 chron-
icle the death of the Rev. Father
O'Mahoney, formerly of this city, but lat-
terly of Kendalltown, Wis. The sad oc-
currence 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
emulating qualities: his kindness, amiabil-
ity 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 accepta-
bly filled the pulpit of St. Peter's and all
privileged to assist at his sermons re-
tain 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, Ire-
land, 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, Ire-
land, and completed it with the Holy
Cross Fathers in St. Johns, New Bruns-
wick, 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 Mari-

time Provinces and Quebec extensively,
and was a professor in Notre Dame Uni-
versity, 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 Mil-
waukee, where he remained until his
decease, a period of about a year and a
half. May he rest in peace.

THE C. P. E. 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 gen-
eral 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 con-
summation of the bargain between the
Canadian Pacific Syndicate and the Govern-
ment 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 ex-
tent 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 giv-
ing 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 Cana-
dian people through the construction of
that line by a Company, we will refer be-
fore closing. The Canadian Pacific rail-
way 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 administra-
tion 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 under-
take the building of a through all rail
route on Canadian territory as a govern-
ment work—a mistake which cost him
the Premiership, and his party what prom-
ised 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 im-
portant subject. At length, in the autumn
of 1880, the Canadian Pacific syndicate,
largely composed of gentlemen interested
in that great enterprise the St. Paul, Min-
neapolis and Manitoba railway, which first
opened the eyes of the world to the wealth
and possibilities of our great North-West-
ern 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 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 rapidly uncalled-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 Cana-
dian Pacific company cannot and
ought not to be blamed for making as
good terms as they could with the govern-
ment 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 just of Lord Claude Hamilton's
complaint against the Pacific railway is
that the aid extended by the Canadian
government to the road has been expen-
ded 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 re-
plenish its exchequer by cash obtained from
the Canadian Government. It was iniqui-
tous 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 Eng-
land, or even, he thought, in the United
States. The Grand Trunk did not ob-
ject 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 pub-
lic 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 connec-
tion 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
\$25,000,000, 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 Parlia-
ment 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 dis-
charges 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 ac-
cording 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 asser-
tion of Lord Claude Hamilton. The
member for Northumberland tells the
noble lord that in the same sentence in
which he unjustly denounces the govern-
ment of Canada for the iniquitous pro-
ceeding 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 rail-
ways, even those competing with them."
Mr. Mitchell tells him that the state-
ment 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 mem-
ories 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, in-
deed, state what is the course in England
in such matters, nor do we care, but we
must say that His Lordship's affected dis-
dain 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 dis-
played an enterprise and a patriotic in-
terest 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 re-
sources of Canada they have insisted, or
may in the future insist, upon

the active co-
government of
great work of nation-
national consolida-
Trunk is really more
ation than Canadi-
from London, Engli-
east and west—P.
Chicago, Ill., are both
dian Pacific, on
work that owes its in-
energy and Canada
our great national
Canadians, and de-
world the vast area
ern domain and ma-
Grand Trunk never
ness could not more
prosperity unequalled
surpassed. To Mr.
exposition of the r-
ada, Lord Claude
deign to reply, shel-
"etiquette." The
felt mortified and
mere colonist shoul-
ments. Mr. Mitche-
regardless of "etic-
agony in a manner
hearted scion of Iris-
had never seen C-
concludes in these
ous, earnest, and p-
rest assured that
Canada is hencefor-
people of Canada,
polity, and break the
Parliament that sat-
his Lordship and hi-
ates seek monopol-
Government or by
or by attacking the
the Dominion in E-
means it may be fo-
fell purpose, the p-
both the will and
themselves against
spiracies to place t-
way traffic of the
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, and
and the energy and
and vast resource
Canadians will rise
machinations of the
Lord Claude Hamil-
ed, will see a new
Dominion worthy
and especially wor-
refused to place th-
of an English corp-
change speculator
cution rather than
the Grand Trunk
company in England.
Mr. Mitchell's v-
echo in every Can-
will suffer no in-
affairs by strange-
monopoly. She l-
tional highway f-
That the construc-
this great highway
Canada's entire de-
eign control is the
hope and the mos-
tions.

CATHOLIC EDU-

We reproduce
graph from the De-
nal of the 20th ult.
ing of Catholic se-
in Ireland. It is
most of our read-
His Lordship the-
his return from the
eulogistic terms
and their good v-
His Lordship's v-
gerated the Free-
tists.

Our Dublin cont-
"«We publish to
those students at
amination who
honours and priz-
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 s-
shares his proud
other eminent
Stamislans," Tull-
den who fills th-
of the year, and
prominence are
the various Cath-
throughout the
tain Brothers, a
well to the fr-
tribute to
their education-
large number of
have carried av-
that the first pla-
grades has been
dents. St. Mal-
of the Senior, th-
the Middle,
Academical In-
Junior. The Sch-
Alexandra Scho-
places of the gr-
the second pla-
we are gratified
a pupil of St. L-
In the more p-
jects, as, for ex-
tie economy, s-
the convents of
financial results
£2,000 more t-
distributed. O-
cent, has fall-
£1,889, or 37 p-