

enough, made so much of this young woman as to have involved our own characters with that of some obscure guilty person, doubtless, who very probably has no character to lose. I think measures should at once be taken by the heads of all families who have patronised her, if Ada is quite correct in what she says—and the name of Miss Seton appears to me quite conclusive. It is a good authority.

‘One thing must be done, my dear, and that immediately,’ said Mr. Burnett, rising with a severe countenance, and striking his fist on the table, ‘and that is, we must dismiss this very day, this most unfortunate girl—who has her talents, my dear, what her skill in teaching music to the children compared to the imminent danger we are in of their becoming contaminated by intercourse with one who has, no doubt, fallen very grievously and in consequence of that fall that obliged to abandon her own country—her beauty has been her ruin depend on it, poor sinful creature. However, we must not put our own innocent girls in the way of harm to their immortal souls, so let her go at once.’

‘Poor sinful creature—sinful, indeed,’ repeated the ladies, echoing the words of their respected male relative.

There was a moment's pause: then Mrs. Burnett, somewhat timidly, suggested ‘that she felt the necessity there was of not suffering the young person to attend again, but at the same time there was a certain amount of awkwardness in dismissing her so peremptorily—what should she say?’

‘What should you say, my dear wife! you really astonish me. I should have thought a person of your sound judgment, and I may say it without flattery, also your piety, did not require her husband to suggest what she would say—speak to the point; or, perhaps better write to the young person—tell her her services are not required longer; and hear, let me know what amount we owe her, and I will write a cheque or the same at once.’

‘But, my dear,’ timidly expostulated the wife, ‘we are sending her away in the middle of the quarter—she is sure to ask why she is dismissed so abruptly.’

‘Simply you are to do as I tell you—say that we will pay for lessons she has not given instead of a notice, but require her services no longer. Were she to press the matter, tell her at once that knowing nothing of her antecedents, we have determined on breaking the engagement.’ So saying Mr. Burnett left the room, proud in the consciousness of his own virtue and in the diligence which he exercised as the father of a family. He was one of those Pharisees who are righteous overmuch, who could judge and condemn a fellow-creature without a trial, and who was quite unmindful of the necessity of exercising the great attribute of mercy in his intercourse with those around him. This was only one specimen out of several which on that morning decided the fate of poor Aileen.

In one other case the line of conduct pursued by her employer closely resembled that adopted by the Burnetts—she was dismissed and knew not the cause, for Mrs. Burnett, with somewhat more of a kindly spirit than that which actuated her husband, had so worded her letter as to conceal from Aileen that she was dismissed on account of any fault having been found with herself.

When, however, the second letter arrived containing a dismissal, she began to experience a degree of uneasiness to what cause could she attribute this summary way of acting with her on the part of two of the most wealthy of her patrons? It was impossible for her to conjecture the right reason, or anything approaching to it; she only felt convinced that there was something unfathomable connected with it, and she resolved, after discharging the usual work of the day, to pay a visit to her supposed friend, Miss Seton, and see if she would help her to see through the mystery.

On her way to the house of this lady she paid two calls, and though the change was not perceptible as to allow her to make any remark, yet there was an alteration in the manner of her reception. Aileen felt that there was an absence of the friendly warmth which she had hitherto experienced, for which she was wholly at a loss to account.

Seriously alarmed, she now turned her steps to seek an interview with the woman who was the author of all this mischief. She received her as usual; spoke of the weather, of Mrs. Delmar's charming soirée, and showered upon her hypocritical expressions of sympathy, because, she said, her pale cheek told her that she was exerting herself far beyond her strength.

‘Oh! dear Miss Seton, I am strong and well enough in body,’ replied Aileen to this false friend, ‘but sorely distressed in mind. I have, this morning, received a hasty dismissal from two families in which are my best pupils, and am confident that there is something wrong for which I in vain strive to account, for, on calling on two other families, I have received, to say the least, but a very cold, nay, almost an uncourteous reception.’

‘It must be merely your fancy, you foolish child,’ said Miss Seton, with a very patronizing air; ‘something has doubtless occurred to make those who have written to you wish you to discontinue your lessons for the present. And as to the friends upon whom you have called, whom you imagined to be colder than usual in their manners, take my word for it, it will turn out to be nothing but a chimera of your own excited brain; you are so imaginative, you see, you people of genius, and so sensitive, that commonplace folk cannot always keep pace with you; but now, *madame*, I must insist on your taking off your mantle and bonnet, and spending the rest of the day with me. If you've lost four of your pupils, you will soon have others to make up for them. You must not be so quickly discouraged, for have you not, she added, literally taken Toronto by storm during the few months of your residence here; and you know, after all, my dear Miss Lascelles, there are persons as talented, or even more talented than yourself, who have not one half of the extensive patronage you have met with.’

‘Ah, false friend, false, deceitful friend, for more deadly is your treachery when perchance you are of the softer sex. Have you met a false friend, you who shall read those pages? Was this treacherous one a woman? If so, you will bear us out in what we say; for you, too, will know that her treachery is more refined, the line of action to which she will stoop more subtle than that of man will ever be. He strikes for higher game, and would shame to have recourse to the arts practiced by some faithless woman, who calls herself your friend, and awaits the opportunity to stab you in the back.’

Look back, if the history of your life, the records of the past unfortunately placed such an one in your path, and a good memory, sometimes a painful acquisition to the possessor, will bear witness to the truth of what we say.

Aileen, in the simplicity of her heart, still tried to believe Miss Seton her friend, and accordingly passed a pleasant day; and on returning home endeavored to indulge the vain hope that probably some strange concatenation of circumstances might have led to the withdrawal of pupils in no less than three families on the same day, and that Augusta was correct when she said that it was her own fancy which had led her to believe that those whom she had visited had received her coldly.

However, time, which makes all things manifest to us, revealed most clearly a very dreadful truth to Aileen. By some strange means it appeared certain to her that that she had, in the brief space of one week, lost several of her friends and admirers, consequently her pupils. Of all evils, suspense is, perhaps, one of the worst, and she speedily began to suffer all the tortures of severe mental anxiety.

It seemed to her excited imagination as if she were suffering under the influence of some baleful spell, and her excitement was increased when a little later the quarters of two of the pupils which fell due were not renewed.

She was left almost alone to brood sorrowfully over the change in her altered circumstances, for the architectress who had caused her misery was absent from home. Had she still a soft spot left in an already hardened conscience; however it may be, she left Toronto, on a visit to New York, for some months, very shortly after having spread her false report, and Aileen was, as usual, solitary and alone, brooding over the mystery to her so unattractive.

(TO BE CONTINUED.)

SUPREMACY OF THE POPE.

LECTURE BY THE REV. FATHER O'FARRELL. (From the Toronto Freeman.)

The announcement having been made in the several churches of the city, on Sunday, that a lecture would be delivered the following evening, in the Cathedral by the Rev. Father O'Farrell, a large audience assembled in that sacred edifice to hear that ripe scholar and accomplished orator. The subject of the lecture—The Supremacy of the Pope—is one full of interest for the Catholic. The events which have occurred, of late years, and discussions which are daily held in reference to this grand doctrine of Catholic faith, both in the pulpit and in the press, have given it a prominence and a significance which Protestants feel and acknowledge. Hence it was by no means surprising to see a great many of our intelligent and inquiring separated brethren attentive listeners to the burning eloquence and cogent arguments of Father O'Farrell, on Monday evening.

In the sanctuary we observed the Very Rev. J. F. Jamot, V. G. Very Rev. F. P. Rooney, V. G. Rev. J. B. Proulx, Very Rev. Father Rice, O. M. Rev. J. P. Kennedy, Rev. J. O'Donohue, Rev. J. M. Laurant, Rev. W. J. White, Rev. Father Connor, St. Basil, Rev. Mc Cassidy, etc.

The Choir having sung the *Veni Creator Spiritus*, the reverend lecturer commenced the discussion of his grand subject, of which we can only give a faint outline. He said to effect:

The supremacy of the Pope, is a phenomenon that must appear most extraordinary to philosophic and Christian minds. Out of the Christian population of the world one third, or two hundred millions, acknowledge the supremacy of the See of St. Peter. With diversity of mind, disposition and clime, they submit themselves to the authority of an old man, which they could easily cast away, or emancipate themselves from. Another one third embracing the members of the Greek Church, admit in principle the supremacy of the Pope, since they acknowledge his right of the primacy of the Western Churches. The remaining third of the whole Christian world, therefore take a stand in opposition to what is practiced, and professed by the great body of professing believers, in the Gospel of Christ. The supremacy of the Pope is the great question upon which the Catholic Church, and the various Protestant denominations, are at issue. It is a question which deserves the most serious consideration, and should engage the earnest study of every one, who desires to arrive at the truth in religion. The Rev. gentleman asked his hearers to consider the fact of the Pope being in possession of his authority for so many centuries, of it being recognized by so great a body of Christians. Up to the period of the Reformation, the German and Latin world acknowledged the Pope as, Chief Pastor in the Church of Christ. If we go back one thousand years, we find his authority undisputed.—Not a voice in Europe, not a voice in Asia was raised against him. A thousand years ago, when Charlemagne was remodelling Europe, when thought was so active and men's minds and moods so independent, all bowed down in obedience to the Sovereign Pontiff. If we go back fifteen hundred years, we discover the same unanimity in granting to the Pope the same prerogative. All have recognized, at one time or another his authority. The Pope, then can say, for fifteen hundred years I am in possession, and I am entitled to hold it, till you can drive me out of it by positive proof. The Pope might rest satisfied with the prescriptive right derived from his long possession, but he, the Rev. lecturer, would bring forward proofs of his title deeds. Rome has the benefaction of all the priests of the Catholic Church. No child of the Church but must look with wonder, and love to the rock, upon which Peter is seated. Every Catholic bows down with reverence to the See of Rome, and receives with obedience its decisions. All other dogmas sink into insignificance compared with the supremacy of the Pope. To acknowledge the authority of the Sovereign Pontiff, is a condition necessary to be a sincere Catholic. Steadily this dogma is gaining away over the minds of those, who have been most antagonistic to Catholic truth. The greatest enemies of the Pope are becoming his most ardent defenders. The Rev. gentleman here alluded to the number of distinguished and learned Anglican divines who, of late years have joined the Catholic Church, and have become the most zealous champions of the Holy Father. Among these he enumerated the Mannings, Newman, Spencers, Oxleys, Wrights, Willberforces and other eminent English divines. He then proceeded to say, it must be understood that our Lord came on earth to establish a Church, which was to teach His doctrine and gather into it all His children to the end of time. This Church is designated in Holy Writ as Sheepfold, it must

have a Shepherd; a Kingdom, it must have a King; a family it must have a father. It must therefore have unity. Christ had his college of Apostles; out of it He selected one, Peter who was constituted Peter. He gave the privilege of supremacy to St. Peter, as may be seen in the XVth Chapter of St. Matthew. ‘Whom do you say the Son of man is?’ Peter is here distinguished from all the other Apostles. He makes a profession of faith in the divinity of Christ, and the Redeemer promised to reward him. The privileges given to him by his divine Master are threefold. His name was changed.—Christ made him what the new name signified, *Cephas*, a rock ‘and upon this rock I will build my Church.’ This is the first privilege, strength and durability. Like a wise builder in contradiction to him who is mentioned in the Gospel as having built upon sand, Christ determined to build His Church upon a rock to provide against all the dangers and tempests, by which it would be assailed by the powers of earth and hell. Peter, consequently holds the same relation to the Church that the foundation does to the building. The building is raised in proportion to the depth and solidity of the foundation. ‘All the strength of the Church depends upon the power given to St. Peter. ‘The gates of hell shall not prevail against it.’ It was an Eastern custom to speak of the gates of a city as denoting strength. The whole strength of the Church is made to rest on Peter. He is not merely the foundation stone. He receives ‘the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven,’ which is the same as the Church. He made Peter the guardian and ruler, the guide and master of His Church. Power, in Oriental countries, was expressed by the keys. ‘He bears the keys on his shoulder,’ meaning thereby, he had all the symbol of authority. We have a remnant of this custom now, as we know by the fact that the keys of the various cities visited by the ruling sovereign are presented by the head municipal officer to the potentate. Peter is not only the keeper of the keys, he is to use them. ‘Whoever thou shalt bind on earth, &c.’ The same promise was afterwards given to all the other Apostles; but Peter received it alone. This shows a special privilege was conferred upon which His Church was to be built, which was never to fall. He made him by the keys master, having full control, giving him power to bind and loose. ‘The other apostles were made subject to the power of the keys and therefore subordinate to Peter. Is this power to die with Peter? It was not a personal privilege. The Primacy was necessary in the Church, which was to be formed as a kingdom.—Therefore there must be a king; therefore there must be a head. Peter was not to live for ever. The flesh, and bones, and faith of Peter, after his death, were not to last for ever. But the promise of Christ was to endure for all time. Therefore, when Peter left the earth, it was necessary that the Primacy should be continued.

THE INSTITUTION OF THE PRIMACY.—When our Lord completed His Church, and before He ascended into heaven, He gave the finishing touch to the edifice. In the 21st chapter of St. John, Christ addresses Peter, ‘Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me.... feed my lambs, feed my sheep.’ Here is the accomplishment of the promise to give him the keys of the Church. The Church is a sheepfold, and our Lord gives to him the care of the whole Church, that is, of the whole flock,—pastors and people. ‘Feed my lambs,—give them good doctrine. He is made the judge of controversy, the centre of unity. The sheep and lambs compose the whole flock of Christ. The apostles are evidently comprised in the flock. Peter is therefore made master of sheep and lambs. At the last supper the saviour tells Peter that Satan hath desired to sift the whole of them like wheat,—and he did sift them during the passion—but, He adds, ‘I have prayed for thee, that thy faith may be confirmed, and that thou strengthen thy brethren. He only prayed for Peter that his might not fail, as their head. He prayed for Peter's faith because upon that faith should be the foundation of the Church that he might confirm his brethren. And so it has been for eighteen centuries. Rome has never known a heresy. The prayer of Christ has been well heard for Peter's faith has confirmed the whole world. In the whole Scriptures, taking even the expressions used in reference to the Trinity and to the Incarnation of the Son of God, there are no words clearer than those that establish the Primacy of Peter. How did Peter act? Did he exercise the supremacy? The first twelve chapters of the Acts of the Apostles are exclusively taken up with the narrative of Peter's doings and sayings. They are the history of him as head of all the other apostles. When there was question of the election of a successor to the traitor Judas, Peter, standing up in the midst of the apostles, like a general, spoke of the fall of Judas, and told them that one must be chosen to fill his place. He acts as a superior and St. John Chrysostom, commenting upon this exercise of his jurisdiction, asks, why he did not make the election himself. Had he the power? Evidently, replies the holy Doctor, for he had all power from the Lord. Again, in preaching the gospel in Jerusalem, Peter was first to address the Jews, to convert them, and to receive them into the Church of Christ. When asked by the Jews, what shall we do to be saved? Peter answers for all the rest—penance. It was Peter who denounced Ananias and Sapphira. It was Peter who denounced Simon Magus when he wanted to sell for money the gifts of the Holy Ghost. Peter was the first to preach the gospel, the first to cure, the first to punish. He was the first, the only one for whom Christ paid tribute, and who alone walked upon the waters. Must it not be, then, perfectly evident that Christ gave to Peter an extraordinary power? The whole Christian world for the first nine centuries accepted the supremacy of the Pope without dispute. No one attacked the authority of the Holy See. It was only pretended to attack abuses. The authority of the Pope was acknowledged by the Eastern Church in spite of all the prejudices the Greeks had against the Latins—in spite of heresies and schisms. In all the Greek Councils the bishops universally proclaimed, ‘Peter has spoken in the person of the Pope.’ In the 8th Council—the fourth of which the Anglicans admit to have equal weight with the Gospel—the authority of the Pope is acknowledged. All heresies were put down by Rome. Though an Athanasius, a Eusebius, an Augustine, an Ambrose, a Jerome, or a Chrysostom may have written powerfully and almost with inspiration against the various heresies which sprang up in their day, yet they must be put down by Rome. It was not the personal character of the Pope that gave him this authority, it was the See he governed, it was his divine commission. Tradition tells us that all the Councils were presided over by the Pope. He either presided in person or by proxy. But no matter whether he was represented by a prince of the Church or by a simple deacon, his authority was recognized and submitted to by the Fathers of every successive Council. It was to the Pope that all the great bishops appealed in case of any controversy. It was by the Pope all heresies were condemned. It is the Pope, whenever there is danger, sends out the warning cry. In other sees there may have been great men. Hippo and Constantinople, Alexandria and Antioch, have responded with the golden eloquence and learning of illustrious doctors and fathers of the Church—the faith however, has been taken from them. But the old man of the Vatican sends out his decrees as his predecessors did one thousand years ago, and there is no heresy in Rome. It was the Pope constituted Christianity and sent out missionaries to convert barbarous nations. It was St. Leo, for instance, sent the letter that convoked the Council of Chalcedon, and it was the same illustrious Pontiff who drove back Attila from the gates of Rome. The nations that are most opposed to the Pope, and boast most of their freedom from the control of the Pope of Rome, are the nations which owe all they have of religion, science and civilization, to Rome. Strangers that they who have reaped the most benefit should prove the most un-

grateful. The reverend gentleman here referred to the deep debt of gratitude that England owes to the Roman Pontiff, and he expressed a hope, that the nation which had made it her special mission to oppose the Church of Christ, and to resist the authority of His Vicar upon earth, may bow down with submission to the See of Rome, and that the whole power of England may be brought to acknowledge the power of him who is the Chief Ruler and Pastor, and thereby become the sheep and the lambs of the Church of Christ. He then referred to the antiquity of the Papal dynasty, and quoted Macaulay's beautiful apostrophe, relative to the long and unbroken line of the Roman Pontiffs. We can trace the succession from Pius to Peter—not a link in the long chain wanting. We feel it will last to the end of time. It will resist every storm and in the midst of dangers and persecution the Supremacy of the Pope will appear in all its majesty and all its might. If those who protest against the Pope—if those who, in their ignorance, send up that hellish cry,—‘To hell with the Pope!’—a cry which the only creating liberality and civilization of the age will not long tolerate. If these people but knew who was the Pope, they would, in all humility and obedience, throw themselves at the feet of the representative of Christ and beg his forgiveness. If they but knew him, they would become, as Hurter did, in writing the history of Innocent III, a sincere convert, and acknowledge with him that the Primacy is a divine institution.

The learned gentleman concluded his brilliant lecture, by an earnest appeal to the audience to pray for the enlightenment of those outside the true Church, and for their own perseverance and sanctification. A collection was taken up for the St. Nicholas, after which followed Benediction of the Most Holy Sacrament.

ARCHBISHOP MANNING ON CHURCH ESTABLISHMENTS.

On Wednesday evening a large meeting of Roman Catholics was held in Leeds, for the purpose of raising subscriptions towards the restoration of the Gantebury in Rome.

Archbishop Manning spoke at great length in asserting the claims of St. Thomas to be regarded as the great martyr of the liberties of the universal Church. He wished to say to every one present who had in him anything of Irish nationality, that he knew no martyr who should be dearer to his heart than he who had laid down his life for those very principles for which during the last 300 years he and his ancestors had suffered (applause). The Archbishop proceeded to speak of the principles for which St. Thomas of Canterbury shed his blood and asserted that no martyr in England in his time ever lived so much in the hearts of the people. He was a popular leader and recognized as a soldier who fought the people's cause, and stood in the face of unjust power, and vindicated the liberties dearest to the nation—liberty of soul and conscience. Were these principles living and vital in the present day? He said those principles were not vital now but, as he said before, he believed St. Thomas to have been the first martyr, in that conflict for liberty of conscience and religion which had only happily ceased in our days; and he would say further that he agreed with a great French writer who forty or fifty years ago said there was hardly a character in history against whom history had conspired with such constant uniform, and, he might add, intense resolution to defame and misrepresent as St. Thomas of Canterbury. He had said the other day, and he repeated it, that St. Thomas only laid down his life for the first and vital principle of the Catholic Church—namely, its freedom in religion and in discipline. And he also laid down his life for the laws of England—for England was then Catholic, and then the liberties of the Catholic Church were embodied in the laws of the land. If he had not done so he would have betrayed the laws of England which as Lord Chancellor he had learned and administered. This was of great importance, but there were one or two things, which were circumstantial, and which he (the Archbishop) must refer to. First of all, the other day it had fallen to his lot to make reference to the bull by which the Holy Father had proclaimed a General Council. The words which he spoke were most correctly reported in the Leeds Mercury of the following day, but most incorrectly in the newspapers of London—not through any ill intention he was perfectly convinced. They omitted what seemed not to be important, and put in what seemed to be to the point; but, unfortunately, there was omitted what was exceedingly important. Then there came immediately certain articles declaring that he had announced, with all authority which might attach to him, that the Pope had declared to the world the separation of Church and State. That was received with great astonishment, and immediately there appeared a letter of great respectability headed ‘The Pope a Heretic.’ This was by comparing himself with himself, and the syllabus issued three or four years ago was quoted to show that the Pope had condemned himself. He (the Archbishop) was, of course, stated to be the authority for that announcement; but unfortunately the words put into his mouth were those of an eloquent speaker in the French Chamber for he (the Archbishop) said it had been lately stated in that place that the Pope had declared the separation of Church and State, and he went on to correct the error. He hoped he had declared himself of heresy, for in that he and the Pope were accomplices, and must stand or fall together (applause.) He hoped that would console many of his friends in the south of England, and that all those who had confided in that supposed statement, which was never made, would at least feel that there was no ground for alarm. On that there arose immediately some magnificent articles on the same subject, which had about them all the splendour of the clouds in the evening, but with a sort of majesty there was a lamentable degree of emptiness. With a certain degree of Oriental magnificence, and a fullness of prismatic coloring, there came a torrent of eloquence which he scarcely knew how to describe, but he thought he had before recognised somebody of the sort, and it was declared that he had said the world was turned upside down; but the writer consoled his readers with the assurance that there had been no perceptible disturbance of the heavenly bodies observed at Greenwich, that the pools and lakes had not been emptied by any revolution of a peculiar kind, and after a great deal of that kind of comment the writer went on to say that he had proclaimed that the bull respecting the general council had declared that the civil powers of the earth were to be universally subjected to the spiritual, that princes were to be discredited and statesmen exiled, and there was to be all that dreadful phenomena, which were generally supposed to portend the end of the world. Now, all he said was this, that the Pope had declared, not for the separation of church and state, but that the spiritual power was supreme in the world, and the basis on which the church rested, and all other powers in the world were necessarily guided by and dependent on the supreme spiritual power, and he said, when he heard of a spiritual church being in any other position, they heard of a world turned upside down, because they heard of a church dependant on the civil power, and a church not borne up and supported by immutable and vital principles, but by the buttresses of laws and acts of Parliament. That had been called a world turned upside down. Well, none of the stars had fallen from heaven in consequence, but one could not see what revolution might occur if what the Pope had not declared were to be declared by a much more earthly power (cheers.) Without going further into this point, there was another which brought him again to St. Thomas of Canterbury. The same writer went on to say that the establishment of religion was the great guarantee for all our civil and religious liberties—that was to

say, laws and acts of Parliament establishing a church—and bringing to bear the force of law on religion—was the great guarantee for our civil and religious liberties (laughter.) It appeared that his audience did not believe this, but to it stood written, ‘He had always read English history in directly, the inverse sense (applause.)’ He believed that the principles with St. Thomas of Canterbury vindicated by his death would not be found to owe their existence to an Established Church. ‘He would not enter, however, upon what would, perhaps, be a painful and needless digression, but he would make certain references, so that those who had affirmed to the contrary might consider them at their leisure. He wished any one who had that opinion to read a work entitled ‘The Penal Laws against the Catholic Church,’ and Dr. Moran's work on the penal laws applied to Ireland, and he thought going would satisfy any impartial mind that it was not the legal establishment of a religion which had produced civil and religious liberty in England; either to those who were Nonconformists or Catholics, or in Ireland. If that was not enough he would commend them to the book by Mr. Skeats, the barrister, and he believed, a Nonconformist, under the title of ‘History of the Free Churches.’ In one word, the last mentioned book traced the history of Nonconformity from the time of Queen Elizabeth to the time of Queen Victoria, showing how one-half of the English people, unable to endure the intolerable yoke of a State religion, had released themselves from it, and had obtained religious freedom by rejecting that which had been said to be the guarantee for civil and religious liberty (cheers.) He would not refer to Scotland, but as some people might say the first two books were written by the Roman Catholics, and the last by a Nonconformist, he would add that they should read Macaulay's history. Let any one read his account of the Star Chamber and of the Court of High Commission, and, finally, of the attempt to establish episcopacy in Scotland. If these references were not sufficient to show that our civil and religious liberties had not been guaranteed by the establishment of a religion, but been vindicated and obtained only in proportion as that legalised establishment had been undone, he would give up the attempt to prove anything from history (cheers.) So much for the first circumstance, as he would call it. It was said a day or two ago, in an exceedingly temperate, and he must say just and respectable letter, signed ‘Free Kirk!’ that he had said St. Thomas of Canterbury died because he had refused to allow the temporal power to nominate bishops and it was to deceive the English people to say that what he died for was what the English people held sacred. What he said was that the Free Kirk would not allow the civil power to nominate their bishops, but substantially his argument was that St. Thomas died for the liberty of the church, which was the liberty of the clergy; but the liberty of the laity was contained in the liberty of the clergy. God had ordained that they should be pastors and leaders of flocks to go first into the conflict, and to lay down their lives as St. Thomas did for the liberty of the flock. When you speak of an army you speak of the rank and file, and not of the officers only; but he was a bad officer who did not lead his men. ‘I had heard of the old officer who ran away, but told his men to keep on fighting. Oath! he held, however, that those who should lead the laity in the conflict were liberty of conscience and religion were at stake were those whom God had appointed to be pastors, and those pastors were unworthy who did not expose their lives to peril and death before any laymen came into the conflict (hear.)’ Not to lay down their lives for the sake of such liberty, was a thing impossible in the Catholic Church. Possible it was in those bodies separated from her unity. Quite possible, he thought, in Scotland. Impossible in Ireland. Impossible in Ireland because she was Catholic (cheers.) Impossible among the Catholics of England, and impossible throughout the church in all the world. There was a most remarkable proof of the truth of this in the Times of Tuesday. In that paper there was an excellent article commenting upon the painful uncertainty in which certain magnificent persons were placed from the fact that when they had built churches they had no certainty as to what ritual of doctrines would prevail in these churches, and the article said with great truth that that uncertainty was having a paralyzing effect upon the munificence of good people, because when the church was built there might be practised in it the extreme of ritualism or taught the extreme of rationalism. There was no possibility of so doing among Catholics. The Catholic laity always knew what doctrines would be preached in their churches (hear.) The Archbishop here almost abruptly reverted to the cause for which St. Thomas of Canterbury died, and he showed that it was in resistance to infractions of the law, such, for instance, as allowing any but ecclesiastical judges to try a clergyman accused of any offence. It may have been unfortunate that there was such a law, but St. Thomas was bound to defend it, and he stood forth in maintenance of that law, and resisted the Royal power when that power was used in violation of the Royal oath. Dr. Manning defended the character of St. Thomas against the charge of covetousness, and alleged that his aims far exceeded those of his predecessors. In conclusion the Archbishop contended that St. Thomas died for the liberty of believing the truth, and predicted that it would yet be acknowledged that he was a noble Christian martyr, who stood out for that which the people of his day held to be the most sacred, and would build for him shrines nobler than that of Canterbury, nobler than the church of St. Thomas at Rome—a love and veneration for the name of St. Thomas of Canterbury in the hearts of the English people (loud cheers.)

ST. PETER'S AND THE VATICAN.

A part from its religious character, and considered merely as an architectural monument, the cathedral of St. Peter's at Rome had been criticised and praised as one of the most wonderful structures ever erected—not on account of its exterior, which, owing to its unfavourable situations and surroundings, is not imposing, but chiefly for its immense size—for its colonnade, fine front, vast interior and truly majestic dome, which rises 405 feet above the pavement or to the top of the cross, 448 feet. It will be remembered that Michael Angelo was eighty-seven years old when he finished the dome, and, for seventeen years, he gratuitously directed an undertaking which had enriched some of the earlier architects.

One peculiarity about St. Peter's is noticed by every visitor; namely, the equable temperature which is said to be nearly the same the whole year. The first impression of the size of the interior of St. Peter's is always disappointing; but this feeling wears away after a few visits, when the visitor has had time to study its details, and wander about its nave and chapels. The Spanish cathedrals are pervaded by a rich, solemn gloom, they impress the mind as religious enclosures, where devout people come to worship; but the leading churches of Rome produce no such solemn impression. The interior of St. Peter's is warm, light and cheerful; its fine mosaic pictures, its splendid monuments, and its numerous array of marble statues, together with the multitude of strangers with the inevitable Murray in hand, and the paucity of worshippers, make the place seem more like a vast museum than a church. The palace of the Vatican, or more properly speaking, the palace of the Vatican, adjoin St. Peter's. They constitute a vast pile of irregular buildings, from whatever point the view is obtained. There is no harmony, no unity—all seems to be confusion. Every visitor is curious to know in what part of the edifice the Pope resides, and where Antonelli takes up his headquarters; but no one seems to know, except that certain long, tedious stairways are supposed finally to reach the apartments occupied by these celebrated personages. The Vatican is a very