

The True Witness

AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE, PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY

No. 195, Fortification Lane, by J. Gillies to whom all Business Letters should be addressed.

G. E. CLERK, Editor.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE:

To all country Subscribers, Two Dollars. If the Subscription is not renewed at the expiration of the year, then, in case the paper be continued, the terms shall be Two Dollars and a half.

The TRUE WITNESS can be had at the News Deposits. Single copies, 5 cts.

To all Subscribers whose papers are delivered by carriers, Two Dollars and a half, in advance; and if not renewed at the end of the year, then, if we continue sending the paper, the Subscription shall be Three Dollars.

The figures after each Subscriber's Address every week shows the date to which he has paid up. Thus "John Jones, Aug. '71," shows that he has paid up to August '71, and owes his Subscription from that date.

S. M. PETTINGILL & Co., 37 Park Row, and Geo. BOWELL & Co., 41 Park Row, are our only authorized Advertising Agents in New York.

MONTEAL, FRIDAY, APRIL 9, 1875.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

Friday, 9—St. Vincent Ferrer, C. (April 5.) Saturday, 10—Of the Immaculate Conception. Sunday, 11—Second after Easter. Monday, 12—St. Leo, P. O. D. (April 11.) Tuesday, 13—St. Hermenegild, M. Wednesday, 14—SS. Tiburce and Comp., MM. Thursday, 15—Of the Blessed Sacrament.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

We would respectfully call the attention of our friends in the United States and the Lower Provinces to whom we are this week sending accounts and request that they will without delay forward to us the several amounts. They will learn in another part of the paper that after the first of May next the Publishers of Newspapers must themselves pay the postage heretofore paid by the subscribers and as a consequence Publishers cannot afford to send the paper to any subscriber whose subscription is not paid in advance. The Publisher of the True Witness begs to inform his patrons that they will after the first of May, receive the paper free of postage and earnestly request them to pay up at once.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

The defection of several of the Carlist Generals, following fast upon that of Cabrera would seem to denote that the cause of King Charles VII. is hopeless. This does not necessarily mean that the cause of King Alfonso is very bright, for the young man's difficulties will only commence then when the legitimists having been crushed he shall find himself face to face with the Revolution. The reports transmitted by cable, which, however, we must always receive with great caution, say that a Papal Nuncio has left the Vatican for Madrid, with instructions to the clergy of Spain, to co-operate for the establishment of the throne of Alfonso.

What the condition of Catholics was in England in the days of Elizabeth will shortly be that of the Catholics of Germany in the latter end of the nineteenth century. All intercourse between Catholics and the Vicar of Christ is about to be prohibited by law, and the commission given by Our Lord Jesus Christ to Peter and his successors, is to be suspended by Prince Bismarck. How such laws can be enforced unless there be attached to their violation penalties as severe as those with which the Elizabethan code visited refractory Papists holding communication with the Pope, or bringing into the realm letters or bulls from Rome, we do not see; but what is easy to foresee, is that though much individual suffering may be caused, though the Church in Germany may be stripped of her last dollar, though her priests and bishops may be reduced to poverty, and be shut in the convict's cell, means will be found, as means were found in England even in the darkest days of the Elizabethan persecution for keeping open the necessary communications with the centre of Catholic Unity, and for securing to the faithful the administration of the sacraments.

A startling rumor reaches us from England by telegram to the effect that the Government has in contemplation in view of the threatening aspect of affairs in Europe, and of the ever increasing difficulty of keeping up the numbers of the British army by means of voluntary enlistment—the establishment of a system of forced conscription.—Such a system is easy enough in Prussia and other countries where there is no Foreign or Colonial service for the army; but we see not how it can be applied to a country like Great Britain, of whose army a great part is always abroad and scattered over the face of the earth. Conscription in Great Britain means social revolution.

The evangelical buffoon season opened in London with great eclat by Messrs. Moody and Sankey is now over; the London Times considers the movement—though merely transitory, in so far as any results on the morals of those who have been drawn within its vortex are concerned—to be worthy of remembrance as exhibiting a strange phase of religious excitement.

'SOCIAL PROGRESS' AND 'MODERN CIVILIZATION.'

However loudly the party of "social progress" and "modern civilization" may vaunt their victories before the world, there is one institution which they will have to destroy before the world will give them credit for any great success. The immense standing armies of the present age are an entirely modern institution, and as indicative of social progress and modern civilization are not assuring. Previous to William the Dutchman's reign, standing armies in England were unconstitutional. To the Plantagenets and Tudors they were totally unknown. Mary said when soldiers

she required out of her own privy purse, besides paying the expenses entailed by Northumberland's misrule. The small standing army which existed under the last of the Stuarts was justly regarded with aversion by all parties in the State. It was the Revolution under William III. which by altering the relative positions of the prince and parliament, altered also the relative positions of the army and people. By voting a standing army England's constitution was overthrown and "social progress" made one slip towards that curiously anomalous position it at present holds. Since then to "social progress" and our Dutch William we owe our standing armies, let us see what "the idea" has cost the world.

Previous to the Franco-Prussian war five million men, the very pick of the young manhood of Europe, stood idly under arms. This estimate does not include militia, national guards, landwehr or volunteers. Were these added it would be found, that upwards of ten million men stood ready in training for cutting each other's throats, burning villages, pillaging, destroying works of art, the collection of centuries, insulting maidens, and all those other little amenities which go to the making up of military life, and the achieving of military glory.

If we would know what this "cutting each other's throats" amounts to, we have only to revert to the "miles of agony" spoken of by Dr. Russell (the Times' correspondent) as seen in the late war on the Rhine and Moselle when tens of thousands of men lay wounded, mangled, mutilated, some of them out of the very semblance of humanity, some dying a lingering death, and others slowly recovering to live a more horrid life. But it is to the money's value of this institution of "social progress," that we would more particularly draw attention, since to estimate the moral effects, destructive qualities or political consequences of these standing armies is simply impossible.

The military and naval expenses of Europe amount annually in money alone to \$620,000,000. Add to this the interest of capital sunk in naval and military establishments (estimated at \$126,280,000) the loss to society by the withdrawal of five millions of men from profitable employment (estimated at \$1,281,190,000) and we have in these three items alone an annual sum of money extracted from the toiling millions of Europe in the name of "social progress and modern civilization" which would pay the board at \$2.00 a week of two-thirds of the population of England for a year.—And all this expended in enabling five millions of men to cut scientifically and skilfully each other's throats, and to destroy whatever property may come in their way!

In England alone the expenses of her army and navy for thirty years would pay off the whole national debt.

And what is the condition of the people in the various countries of Europe from whom this prodigious sum is yearly extracted?

Toiling from morning to night to keep the wolf starvation from their doors. Behold those toiling millions spread over the whole face of Europe from the Rock of Gibraltar to the Ural Mountains; from the straits of Constantinople, to the Sketland islands—see them swarming by day to their labor—working ceaselessly from day break to dusk in mines, in factories, in forges, in docks, in workshops, in warehouses, in squalid garrets—braving dangers on railways, on lakes, on canals, on the ocean—penetrating into the bowels of the earth and the gloom of the forest. Behold those toiling millions with the sweat of a year's toil still upon their garments reckoning up at the year's end the amount of their year's saving; and alas! behold just when they have made up the last item, their cottage door opens, "Social Progress" enters in and demands in tones of authority which none dare disobey, a tax amounting to no less a sum than £300,000,000 or £400,000,000 sterling. And this is Modern Civilization!

But you will ask—How much better off were the nations of the earth before social progress invented standing armies? I will tell you. That wars will always be, I greatly fear. Certainly our modern progress has not diminished their frequency by increasing the facilities for prosecuting them.—That wars did exist in medieval times, I admit; but an armed peace is in reality a continued war; and if the nations of Europe during the middle ages fought frequently—(perhaps more frequently than now?) their soldiers at least returned immediately to their cottages rather than to barracks; they resumed the plough share instead of remaining inactive by their guns. In all, but the bloodshed an armed peace is a continued war; and even in the matter of bloodshed and destruction of property, the scientific nature of our modern armaments throws the balance of destructiveness and comparative bloodiness heavily on the side of our standing armies and "modern progress."

Let us take a homely illustration of this armed peace, which "social progress" (alias the degenerating influence of Protestantism) has entailed upon us in the shape of standing armies. There are two men in one city, the one a baker and the other a butcher. The baker hears that his neighbor the butcher is meditating base things against him, and forthwith hires one with a thick stick to perambulate before his door, to prevent his loaves from being stolen, and himself injured. The butcher viewing the warlike preparations of his brother, the baker, and fearing this destruction of the "balance of power" immediately hires a like belligerent armed with a like, or if possible, a heavier stick and posts him before his door with orders to keep himself awake and his powder dry. The baker fearful of this increased armament sends for another giant and another black thorn, and posts them before his door, with urgent orders to be watchful and active and to set in willing concert with their companions. Thus these two foolish men go on wasting their substance on bludgeon men and bludgeons all in the interest of peace and standing armies, as long as their funds or the credulity of their creditors will allow them. What wonder, if the sirloins and loaves soon cease to put in an appearance in the stalls of the butcher and the shelves of the baker! What wonder, if peace in spite of all these preparations and all this

precaution is soon banished from the neighborhood never again to return until one side at least—either the belligerent baker or the belligerent butcher—has bitten the dust! And yet this, we are told, is Social Progress! Alas Social Progress! Alas Modern Civilization!

JOHN MARTIN.

Last week we briefly announced the death of John Martin, M.P. at his home on Monday, March 29th. The deceased gentleman was born at Lougborne, County Down, on the 8th of September 1812 being the oldest son of Samuel Martin and Jane Harshaw, both natives of that neighborhood, and members of old Presbyterian families. When about twelve years of age, young Martin was sent to the school of Dr. Henderson, at Newry, where he first became acquainted with John Mitchel. Soon afterwards he entered Trinity College and took his degree in Arts. In 1833 he devoted himself to the study of medicine, but abandoned it owing to a delicate nervous organization and attacks of spasmodic asthma. He came out to America in 1839, and visited a relative in the extreme west of Ontario. On his return home he became a prominent member of the Repeal Association, and earned the close attention of the government which at last pounced upon him, and banished him for ten years beyond the seas. In Company with many others he arrived in Van Dieman's Land in the month of November, 1849; but received conditional pardon in 1854. In 1868 Mr. Martin married the youngest sister of John Mitchel, thus cementing a friendship of many years standing. He was elected to Parliament as representative for Meath in December 1869, and again returned in 1874. His death was caused by asthma, hastened by grief at the death of his kinsman, Mr. John Mitchel. In John Martin Ireland has lost a knight without fear and without reproach.

NOTICE—THE CASH SYSTEM.

As the change in the postal laws will require prepayment of newspaper postage by publishers on and after the 1st of May next, the Publisher of THE TRUE WITNESS begs to notify all concerned that in order to meet the extra outlay the system of advance payments for subscription will henceforth be strictly adhered to. The subscription price will remain the same—\$2.00 per annum. Subscribers will get their papers twenty cents cheaper than formerly, and publishers will have the benefit of a sound subscription list, and a list, too, that will not be diminished by the new method in any case where fair value is given for the money.

Subscribers in arrears for 1875, are requested to settle their accounts before the 1st of May.

Subscribers can ascertain the date up to which they have paid from the date after the address printed on their papers.

The attention of our friends and agents who have kindly manifested active interest in extending the circulation of the True Witness, is especially directed to this announcement; and their cordial co-operation in carrying out the "cash system" insubscriptions is respectfully requested.

To CORRESPONDENTS.—We regret that owing to circumstances over which we have no control, we have been obliged to pass unnoticed a question addressed to us by A Protestant, as to whether we would give place in the columns of the True Witness to replies to attacks on the Protestant religion; in the same way as the Witness sometimes opens its columns to Catholics seeking to answer attacks made in its columns upon their Church and creed?

We cannot pledge ourselves to insert any article or communication in our columns, whose contents we have not first perused; but we will have no objection whatever to allow any Protestant entrusting us with his real name, to reply through our columns to any attacks that through the same channel may have been made upon Protestantism. We cannot pledge ourselves to more than this.

A Pastoral Letter was read in all the Catholic Churches in this city and Quebec on last Sunday, forbidding the reading of the Daily Witness, or in any manner encouraging it, by advertising, &c.

MODERNUS AND ANTIQUUS.

Modernus.—Can you explain to me, Antiquus, why the Christian Church has always admitted infant baptism? It appears to me with the Anabaptists that there is no warrant for it in Sacred Scripture—at least there is no express instance of it.

Antiquus.—You did well, Modernus, to modify your expression thus speedily; since your assertion, "there is no warrant for it," is one thing; whilst your assertion "no express instance of it," is another. That there is no express instance of it, I readily grant; but this surely does not prove anything. We have no express instance, you will remember, in Sacred Scripture, that women partook of the Holy Eucharist, and yet you would not surely wish to maintain on that account, that women must be excluded from the Lord's Supper? Even your pious friends the Anabaptists would not dare affirm this. Again, the Anabaptists maintain, that believers born of baptized parents ought themselves to be baptized; and yet where in the whole Testament is there any express instance of a person born of baptized parents having been baptized? Instances we have innumerable of believing Jews being baptized; but not of an adult child of a believing parent.—These negative arguments, Modernus, are dangerous engines, and often land their employers in curious not to say dangerous predicaments. What would you think of me, were I to assert that none of the Apostles partook with Jesus Christ of the Last Supper? and yet although Christ told them to "Eat," we have no where any express assurance that they obeyed.

Modernus.—Then you do not admit that in those texts of Scripture wherein it is affirmed that whole households were baptized, we have positive proof of infant baptism?

Antiquus.—I do not; since at most they amount to probability. Even in the largest families there are not always infants. Nor in the cases adduced supposing that there had been, does the Sacred Scripture affirm that they were all baptized. We read indeed that the Jailer was baptized, he and all his; but this "all his" does not of necessity mean the infants since we read in the same place, that he believed with all his house; which cannot mean the infants, who must of necessity have been incapable of belief.

Modernus.—How then do you prove that Christ positively intended Infant Baptism?

Antiquus.—The proof is so strong and so con-

vincing, that it is foolish, not to say, *unwarranted*, to have recourse to doubtful arguments. The proof rests on two principles—first, that infants are not excluded from salvation, though they can neither believe nor fulfil any of the conditions which the Scripture requires for the salvation of adults; second, that infants cannot be saved without baptism. The first of these principles your friends the Anabaptists themselves admit, even more fully than I, as a Catholic, can possibly do, since they grant salvation to all infants, even to those unbaptized. The second principle flows from those words of Christ—"Except a man be born of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of heaven." I am not here arguing with the Quakers, who maintain, that the water here spoken of means "the water of the Spirit," and that the baptism of Christ is only an invisible and spiritual baptism. To discuss the question with them would demand another and far different line of argument. In conducting my present proof I presuppose myself arguing with men, who admit water baptism as well as spirit baptism; or in other words with men who do not exclude water baptism. You surely are not a Quaker, Modernus?

Modernus.—By no means. I admit, and I think, the Anabaptists admit, water baptism; but they do not apply it to infants as you do.

Antiquus.—And yet why not? The words of Christ admit of no exception—"Except a man be born again"—"Except a man be born of water and of the Holy Ghost"—here is no possible exception. Modernus.—But our Saviour does not here speak of infants but of grown up men. Many accept it in this sense.

Antiquus.—They might as well accept it in the sense of excluding adult women, since they are as little spoken of as infants. But if we have recourse to the original Greek the difficulty immediately vanishes. In English we unfortunately have no word exclusively devoted to denominate man woman and child; hence the ambiguity. Had we a singular to the word *mankind*, which we have not, the difficulty would vanish; (just as, if our word for a large stone had been *petra* instead of *rock*, the difficulty in rendering Christ's speech to Peter would immediately vanish); but a singular we have not, and we must take things you know as they are, not as they ought to be. The original Greek uses a word which expresses either man-woman-or-child, and hence is most sweeping and comprehensive—"if any one, i.e., either man woman or child be not born again &c." This ought to settle the question; since if Christ had been speaking of Angels, he certainly would have meant *any one Angel*—but he was speaking of mankind and therefore meant either a man-man a woman or a child-man. But in truth the real difficulty with the Anabaptists is, (not in admitting that the expression "if any one" means any man woman or child, but) in admitting that children are capable of regeneration. And this shows the impossibility of people who are arguing from different principles arriving at the same conclusion. The Catholic believing, that infants are capable of regeneration (through baptism) argues that the words "if any one" must include infants; the Anabaptist maintaining that children are not capable of regeneration, argues that the words "if any one" include only such as are capable of regeneration. If children are incapable of regeneration they are certainly incapable of baptism which is only the instrument of regeneration. And here is the inconsistency of Anabaptist doctrine. "None can really enter into the Kingdom of heaven without being born of the Spirit" it says; and yet in the same breath it maintains, that the Catholic doctrine that unbaptized infants can not enter the Kingdom of heaven is monstrous. Surely there is confusion here; for if infants are capable of regeneration why not of baptism too, which is only the sign and instrument of it?

Of two things, one. Either the Anabaptists believe that infants are incapable of regeneration; or they do not. If they believe them incapable, and yet allow that all infants go to heaven, then they admit infants to heaven not as "children" and "heirs" but as *thieves and robbers*. If they believe them capable of regeneration; then are they guilty of the absurdity of refusing them that instrument by which this regeneration is effected. SACRILEGOS.

PARALLEL CASES.

In his late speech on the New Brunswick School Question, the Prime Minister, Mr. Mackenzie—unwittingly, perhaps—knocked the wind clean out of a popular objection against the dogma of Papal Infallibility. He said—

"On a former occasion he objected to the Legislation of the Province of New Brunswick, in so far as it seemed to draw matters to an extreme, without waiting for any judicial decision upon the point at issue, and voted on one occasion in this House, to ask the Government to disallow Acts of that Legislature which legalized assessments made under an Act which was itself at the time subject to judicial revision. He took occasion at that time to say if the decision of the Supreme Court to which the matter would be referred should be to the effect that the legislation was within the competence of that Legislature, that then he should advocate submission to the law; and a resort to that peaceful agitation, which in all free countries produces ultimately, sooner or later, the desired result in the case of all who have particular hardships to be remedied. That decision has been rendered by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The law officers of the Crown, at the time that subject was up for discussion formerly, had given it as their opinion that it was competent for the Legislature of New Brunswick to pass that Act; but that was not a judicial decision, and he was not bound and felt no inclination to pay the same deference to the opinions of the law officers, who are simply legal gentlemen—no doubt of high standing, but still not acting under the same auspices as a judge would be acting on the bench."

The gist of Mr. Mackenzie's argument is this:—That prior to the judicial decision of the Privy Council on the New Brunswick School Act, he (Mackenzie) was free to doubt the constitutionality of the said Act, although the law officers of the Crown had already given their opinion that it was constitutional; but after that final decision he was no longer free to doubt, but became bound to accept the act as constitutional. As he himself says: "he was not bound, and felt no inclination, to pay the same deference to the opinions of the law officers, who are simply legal gentlemen—no doubt of high standing, but still not acting under the same auspices as a judge on the bench."

Now, does any one pretend that this New Brunswick School Act was illegal or unconstitutional because Mr. Mackenzie and many others had grave doubts about it, before the Privy Council adjudicated upon it? Surely not. The Privy Council did not make a *new law*; it only rendered a decision upon a law that already existed.

So with regard to the Infallibility of the Popes. Before the year 1870, individual Catholics were free to doubt whether the Popes were infallible when speaking *ex-cathedra*; but since that year, since the decree of Definition of the Vatican Council, no Catholic can entertain any such doubt. And yet that Definition has created no new doctrine, invented no new truth; it has only raised, to the importance of a dogma, and placed beyond doubt a doctrine, a truth as old as the Church itself.

There appears, therefore, to our mind, a parallel between the position of those Bishops who opposed the Definition of Papal Infallibility, and afterwards proclaimed it in their respective dioceses, and the position of Mr. Mackenzie on the New Brunswick School Question before and after

the decision of the Privy Council as explained by himself and supposing that he acted seriously and honestly throughout. The following extract from a Pastoral Letter (Sept. 10, 1870) of His Grace the Archbishop of Cologne, if placed alongside the speech, will illustrate our meaning:—

"In respect of the doctrine (Infallibility of the Pope) I, in common with many other bishops and laymen, although I have always given my assent to its truth, nevertheless held a different opinion from the majority of bishops at the Council, and made no concealment of my opinion that the definition was inopportune in our time, and I also differed in respect of certain particulars connected with the doctrine. Since, however, after a deep and thorough investigation and examination, the question has been decided by the (Ecumenical Council), in the firm conviction that every Catholic is bound to submit unconditionally his own personal view of the matter to the decision of such Council—the highest legitimate authority in the Church—I have dismissed all previous doubts and anxieties on the subject, and I feel myself bound here publicly to declare that I expect the same submission from every Catholic and subject of this archdiocese, as the fulfilment of a simple duty of their religion."

As the New Brunswick School Act was constitutional before the decision of the Privy Council placed its constitutionality beyond the reach of doubt; so the Infallibility of the Popes when speaking *ex-cathedra* was a principle of Catholic doctrine long before the Definition of the Vatican Council made it a dogma of faith.

As Mr. Mackenzie was free to doubt the constitutionality of the said School Act before the said decision of the Privy Council; so individual Catholics were free to doubt the Infallibility of the Popes before the said Definition of the Vatican Council.

And as Mr. Mackenzie feels bound by the decision of the Privy Council to regard and accept the New Brunswick School Law as constitutional; so—but with far more reason—every individual Catholic is bound by the Definition of the Vatican Council to regard and accept the Infallibility of the Popes when speaking *ex-cathedra* as a dogma of Catholic faith. M. J. W.

PRESENTATION TO FATHER O'BRIEN, BROCKVILLE.

The appointment of the Rev. J. O'Brien to the to the Bishopric, vacant by the death of the lamented Bishop Horan, was received by his parishioners, who love him as the apple of their eye, with mingled feelings of joy and sorrow, and truth to tell the latter predominated. They recognized in the selection made by his Holiness the Pope a tribute to the genuine worth, administrative ability, and great capacity of their worthy pastor, which they all thoroughly appreciated, and his assumption of the purple must have been gratifying; but the loss which his new position entails on them has been keenly felt. During the whole period of his incumbency in the parish extending over a period of ten years, he has by his unvarying kindness and fraternal regard exercised towards all without distinction, enlisted the affection and love of all his parishioners and of many who differ in religious views, and enshrined himself deep in the memory of those over whom he has had spiritual charge. No pastor was more beloved, and the substantial proof was presented there on Sunday last. After the celebration of High Mass a deputation from the congregation consisting of the most prominent members, amongst whom we noticed the Hon. C. F. Fraser, Jno. Ryan, W. Menly, Jno. Murray, Richard Evans, J. Kavanagh, N. McCarney, J. A. O'Farrell, J. C. O'Donohoe, J. D. Kennedy, M. J. MacNamara, Jno. Brady, Esq., and James O'Reilly, Q. C., Kingston, gathered at the altar rails, and upon the Rev. gentleman being called the Hon. C. F. Fraser, read an address and presented him with a purse of \$1,050. The address, rich and touching in language, and containing the sentiments of esteem and affection, but feebly expressing the hold the worthy pastor has upon the hearts and feelings of his people. None in the large and intelligent congregation failed to appreciate to the full extent the loss they were about to sustain, and the half-suppressed sobs and tearful eyes plainly evinced the depth and genuineness of their esteem and devotion. On the conclusion of the address the Rev. gentleman was visibly affected and it was with an effort he recovered himself. He said, amongst other things, that nothing the good people of Brockville could do for him should cause him surprise, as he had at all times received at their hands the most signal mark of their good will and esteem, and this munificent purse and affectionate address but added to the many kindnesses that preceded it. He could with them justly boast of having as noble an edifice in which to worship God as any in Ontario, but all the praise and credit was theirs, he was merely the guide; he pointed to what should be done and it was done, and with a willingness that enhanced the effort. He said he felt he could not do that justice to the address and to the people that he felt their efforts merited, and concluded by wishing them and theirs a life of continued prosperity and grace, and assured them that they should never cease to occupy a place in his memory and his prayers. The deputation then accompanied him to his house; where lunch was had. ADDRESS.

REVEREND FATHER.—The announcement that you are about to assume the exalted office of Bishop of the Diocese is the occasion to us of mingled feelings of regret and satisfaction.

We owe it to your exertions mainly, that, at this moment, our parish is completely freed from indebtedness, and that to-day we have, in an almost furnished state, one of the finest churches in the Province.

From the hour of your coming to us—now some ten years since—your untiring zeal and cheerful attention to every call and every duty that make up the daily work of "the good priest" have always been conspicuous; and none the less so have been the eminent ability and unquestioned talent which, from the outset, characterized your pastorate and priestly duties in our midst.

How, then could it be otherwise than that, with these daily evidences of your goodness and piety and talent, you should have made such a place for yourself in the hearts of your congregation, that your coming departure brings keen regret and sorrow to every one of us.

The one satisfying consolation we have is that we hope—nay, we are certain, that, in your higher sphere of duty, we will still be participants in your spiritual care and watchfulness; that what we lose, the Diocese at large will gain; and that Catholicity throughout the Province cannot fail to be benefited by your advancement to the episcopal dignity.

We feel that there is nothing within our gift that can repay the unwearied faithfulness with which you have labored for us; but, as some assurance that we are neither unmindful nor ungrateful, we ask your acceptance of this offering. In every sense it is far below the measure of our debt; but with it we give you the richer offering of our prayers and heart's wishes that God's best blessings may be yours both for time and eternity.

Signed on behalf of the congregation, R. F. Fraser, John Murray, Patrick Kavanagh, R. Evans, Louis Lachapelle, Wm. Manly, Jr., M. McHade, John C. O'Donohoe, John Ryan, Thomas Brant, Roderick McCreagh, J. O'Farrell, Matthew McManara. Brockville, March 1875.