

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

Published weekly at 44 and 46 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
Editor—REV. GEO. R. NORTHGRAVE,
Author of "History of Modern Ireland."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor.
Messrs. DORRIS GOWAN, LOUIS KIRK and JOHN KIRK are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Agent for Ottawa—F. J. Coffey, Esq.
Agent for Alexandria, Glenora and Lonsdale—Mr. Donald A. McDonald.
Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion.

Approved by the Bishop of London, and recommended by the Archbishop of St. Boniface, the Bishops of Ottawa, Hamilton, Kingston, and Peterboro, and leading Catholic Clergymen throughout the Dominion.
All correspondence on business should be addressed to the Proprietor.
Advance must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.
Persons writing for a change of address should invariably send as the name of their former post office.

Catholic Record.

London, Ont., May 5th, 1898.

MORE PROCLAIMED MEETINGS.

On the 8th ult., seven public meetings were held in different parts of Ireland to demonstrate that the influence of the National League is as powerful as ever, notwithstanding Mr. Balfour's boast in Parliament that it is "a thing of the past." The meetings were held at Loughrea, Tullyallen, Ennis, Kilsnash, Kanturk, Macroom and Miltoown-Mahely. An eighth meeting was held at Scariff, which, though not called for precisely the same purpose, was equally conclusive on this point.

The Scariff meeting was called for the purpose of enabling Mr. Joseph Cox, M. P., to address his constituents. It had no connection with the National League, and the placards announcing it mentioned its object distinctly. The Government, however, being determined to suppress all free speech in Ireland, would not allow such a meeting to be held, though over and over again Mr. Balfour has declared in Parliament and out of it that such is not their intention, and that freedom of speech exists. When the Crimes Act was passing the House, the distinct pledge was given that merely political demonstrations would not be interfered with under it. The people had certainly the right to expect that no obstacle would be thrown in the way of meeting, and as the official Gazette did not proclaim it as illegal, such was expected. In spite of all this the police tore down Mr. Cox's placards, and an impudent message was sent to Rev. Matthew Kenny, P. P., two constables waiting on him to deliver it, that if the meeting were attempted, extra police would be imposed on the district. Even this could by no means constitute the meeting illegal, and Father Kenny treated the messengers with the contempt they deserved.

At the last moment, the evening before the meeting, proclamations forbidding it were posted about the town. A more despotism can scarcely be imagined. The object was evidently to bring about a collision between the unsuspecting people and the police, that the latter might have some shadow of an excuse for attacking them, and the lateness of the proclamation would naturally tend to this result. No one could fail to see that the meeting was a perfectly lawful assembly, and the Chief Police, Captain Keogh, was at a loss to find some reason for its suppression. This was furnished to him by the proclamation, which declared the meeting to be a meeting of the suppressed League, the League which Mr. Balfour has pronounced to be "a thing of the past." It is now suddenly discovered that this "thing of the past" is able to furnish thousands of members to assist at a public meeting, and hundreds of policemen with several companies of soldiers are deemed necessary to suppress them by force.

During the night, the police with their rifles over their shoulders, and the military, poured into the town, many of them greatly under the influence of drink, prepared to force a row with the people who were expected to come in for a lawful assembly.

At Mass, Father Kenny told his congregation that preparations were being made to prevent them from exercising their rights as electors, and advised them to submit peacefully to the force which was brought in for the purpose of preventing a lawful meeting, though the conduct of the real law-breakers, the police, was "an act of oppression such as had never been heard of in the civilized world." He continued:

"Sometimes we hear law and order spoken of by those who have little right to use the word. Well I know that laws come to us clothed at times, in a very peculiar garb, and do not receive the sanction of the people to whom they are applied. This country has sent eighty-six representatives to Parliament, and if the voices of those men be not heard or respected, what respect can we have for the constitution under which we live? What respect for law and order is shown by those who do not respect the opinions or persons of the people's representatives?"

In conclusion he advised them, even under such provocation, not to break the peace, but to "let your enemies see that you are acting justly and honestly, and by thus acting with self-respect, restraint, and propriety, you will have struck a blow against oppression, and for constitutional liberty, which the democracy of England will hear of with gratification."

The concourse of people at the place announced for the meeting was very great, and when Mr. Cox appeared before them, Captain Keogh informed him that he would not tolerate any address to be delivered, and that if any attempt were made to do this he would "use any necessary force at his command to put an end to the proceedings." He added: "We have a force here quite determined to do their duty. They will do it with vigor, with determined vigor, and I ask you to desist, and not cause deplorable consequences."

Mr. Cox and Rev. Father Kenny hereupon requested the people to disperse quietly, which they did after giving hearty cheers for Mr. Cox.

For such conduct as this the servile majority which supports the present Government in their seats is responsible. A more arbitrary procedure could not take place under the rule of the Cox or the Sultan of Turkey. Such facts as these, occurring in the nineteenth century, under the boasted free rule of England, speak more loudly than the tongue of the Nationalist members of Parliament, of the necessity of Home Rule. The sympathy with which an English majority in the House of Commons regards them, shows that they are not fit to govern Ireland, whatever may be their ability to govern themselves.

At Miltoown-Mahely the proceedings were very similar to those of Scariff. The police drew their batons, and the military fixed bayonets, for a charge, after Major Waring read the Riot Act, and the people quietly dispersed. At Kilsnash, Macroom, Kanturk, and Loughrea, the police charged the assembled multitudes with their batons, and many persons were injured, including several of the policemen, and at Ennis and Kilsnash the most wanton brutality was exhibited. Nothing was left undone in the way of aggressiveness to provoke the people. They were beaten with the batons of the police, or stabbed with their bayonets.

Yet after such proceedings, we shall, no doubt, hear it said again that Ireland is subject to the same laws by which England is governed. Such has been in the past the burden of the declamation of the enemies of Ireland and her cause, and we may expect to hear the same tune again. These meetings have proved to demonstrate the falsity of Mr. Balfour's statements that his policy of Coercion has destroyed the Land League, and make manifest the resolution of the people to continue the agitation for their rights until they are gained. Already these barbarous acts are producing good fruit in the sympathy which has been aroused for the cause against which they have been directed. Notably in Scotland, the press have spoken of them with undigested indignation. The *North British Mail* points out to the people of Glasgow that it would have been as reasonable to have suppressed a Liberal meeting which took place the other day in that city, and asks "what would the people think if the speakers at the Glasgow meeting had been hustled off the platform, and the audience had been compelled to flee to save themselves from being batoned and abused?"

Mr. Balfour may be sustained by the present majority in Parliament. Probably he will be; but we trust the time is not far off when he will be solemnly impeached to answer for his deliberate criminality, from the Mitchellstown massacre to his work at Ennis, Scariff and Kanturk.

JUDICIAL INCONSISTENCIES.

In the Court Session at Carrick-on-Suir, on the 5th ult., Colonel Carew and Mr. Vesey Fitzgerald tried sixteen young men for "unlawful assembly." They had formed part of a band which marched through the town on the occasion of Mr. Wilfred Blunt's release from prison. Innocent as the occasion was, such acts as these have hitherto been construed by Mr. Balfour's magistrates as unlawful. There are now in prison many young men whose only "crime" was playing music, or cheering, or lighting bonfires on the release of Mr. William O'Brien or other Nationalists, and even cheering for Mr. Gladstone was held to be enough to constitute an assembly unlawful, and to be a breach of the peace. It will be also remembered that the tooting of a tin horn and similar acts by little girls were deemed sufficient to "intimidate" the courageous Irish police, and were punished with incarceration. In the present case, however, the judges took a different view. Mr. Fitzgerald said he saw nothing in the conduct of the prisoners to connect them with an unlawful assembly. He therefore dismissed the case.

At Newmarket-on-Fergus, two of the magistrates took a similar view, Captain Keogh dissenting. Twelve men were charged with grousing at the police, and shouting "Harvey Duff," on the occasion of Mr. Cox's release. On the occasion of Mr. Snelling's arrest, a man named Thos. O'Neill did similarly, and a young man named William Reidy accidentally knocked against Sergeant Riley while the latter was cautioning a crowd not to light tar-barrels. He was arrested on a charge of assaulting the policeman, but in all these cases the charge was dismissed, as it was not proved that the parties them-

selves were guilty of disorderly conduct, though there was evidence that such "crimes" as we have enumerated were committed by the crowd. The magistrates dismissed all these cases. Is this an earnest of something like justice in the future treatment of accused Irishmen? We can scarcely hope for this under the present regime. It must be either that there are isolated cases of independence among the magistrates, or the latter are beginning to see in the signs of coming changes in the Government. This independence will, certainly, not suit Mr. Balfour. We shall probably next hear that these magistrates will have their commissions cancelled, or at least that they will be warned to give judgment after a manner better suited to the despotism of Balfour rule.

HIGH LOW CHURCHISM.

In Bishop Usher's absurd denunciation delivered at the meeting of the Evangelical Alliance in Montreal, he declared that "in many Protestant churches, it would be hard to tell the service from that of the Roman Catholic Church." The consequence of this he declares to be that "Roman Catholics naturally conclude that Protestants are in sympathy with them." Of course it is well understood that in these incalculable words Bishop Usher had in view the High Church section of the Church of England. It was on account of the dissensions between High-Churchmen or Ritualists, and Low-Churchmen or "Evangelicals," that the sect in which Bishop Usher assumes Episcopal functions originated. It was claimed by the Evangelicals that High Churchism was undoing the work of the Reformation by gradually introducing into the English Church Catholic practices, which would lead to the adoption of Catholic doctrine, and finally bring its advocates into submitting themselves to the authority of the Catholic Church. Nothing is more common than to hear Low Church Protestants assert that High Churchmen are in reality no better than Catholics, or, as they say, "Romanists," and frequently do they declare their readiness to rid themselves of the incubus of High-Churchism; and it was because the Church of England either can or will not rid itself of the High Church party that the "Reformed Episcopalians" have sprung into existence. It is because the ultra-Protestants of Bishop Usher's stamp cannot endure the existence of High Churchism in the same denomination with themselves that they formed themselves into a distinct body.

It cannot be denied that if the primary principle of Protestantism be correct, that the private individual has the right to set up his judgment against that of the Church, the Reformed Episcopalians had a perfect right to cut themselves adrift from the Anglican body, and to set up a business of their own, and to reform the prayer book to suit their views; and indeed Protestants generally have a habit of saying, such a man "has a perfect right to leave his church, if he thinks proper, while he stays in it he should conform to its usages." If this be true, who can deny that the High-Churchmen have the same right of individual judgment which their demonstrative antagonists assert for themselves? It is a poor principle if it cannot be pushed to its consequences; and if this principle be of divine appointment the High-Churchman is just as free, by divine right, to use it as the lowest of the low.

Of course we do not mean to maintain this right of individual judgment as against the true Church of Christ. This would be a gross absurdity; but as against any Protestant denomination the right exists. Against God man cannot have rights, nor against His Church, which is invested with authority from God. But as every Protestant denomination is founded upon this individual right, this fact is sufficient to refute the claims of each Protestant Church to be the Church instituted by Christ.

To the Church, as Christ instituted it, a positive doctrine was delivered which was to be propagated through all nations, everywhere one and the same, and not subject to the whims of individuals or nationalities, as the systems of individual judgment, and of national Churches imply. Hence High Churchism and Low Churchism are equally alien to Christ's institution; and Reformed Episcopalism equally so.

Strongly as High-Churchism may be reprobated by Bishop Usher, it has a standing in the Church of England which enables it to bid defiance to the powers which are arrayed against it. Only a few days ago a convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of Ohio assembled to elect an assistant bishop to Bishop Bedell, who is decidedly Low Church in his views. The clergy wished for a High-Churchman, but the bishop desired a man whose views would be in sympathy with his own. Several ballots took place, with the result that the clergy persisted in carrying out their own views, until Bishop Bedell informed them that he would withdraw his request for an assistant unless his wishes were complied with. Then a compromise was effected by which a bishop acceptable to both parties was elected, with views not too decided either way or the other; and so marked is

the line of separation between the two parties that the bishop virtually informed the convention that young men whose views are not in accordance with his own will in future find it difficult to enter the Theological Seminary at Gambier.

We are also informed that a High-Church clergyman, Dr. Atwell, celebrating the Communion service at Gambier, was greatly shocked at the carelessness of the clergy there in distributing the consecrated bread, "which was scattered on the floor, all along the chancel rail." We presume that this is the style of celebration which would be pleasing to Bishop Usher, instead of the "reverent rendition of the service" which characterized Dr. Atwell's celebration. This seems to be the chief difference between High and Low Church celebration of this service, and as Dr. Usher complains of the High Church methods, it is to be supposed that the Gambier style would exactly suit him.

In London, England, High-Churchism is known to be equally strong and irremediable. The erection of a new rector in St. Paul's, wherein a large crucifix and a statue of the Blessed Virgin have been placed over the communion table, has been the occasion of a great display of Low-Church indignation. Bishop Usher would certainly say of this, as he says of many Montreal Churches, that it would be difficult to distinguish the service conducted at this table "from a Roman Catholic service." One thing made certain by these events, that it is more easy to abuse the High-Churchmen than to suppress them.

From constantly recurring circumstances in the Church of England, or the Protestant Episcopal Church, as it is called in the United States, it is quite evident to all that the Church is hopelessly divided between the two parties we have indicated. Two other parties, equally well defined, hold the balance of power between these two, the Erastian and Broad Church Sections. These four parties all, apparently, accept the Common Book of prayer as their standard of belief, but their interpretations of the prayer-book are widely divergent. When the Prayer-book was composed, it was intended to be non-committal and ambiguous so as to include within the fold of the Church as large a body as possible of the English people. Hence all these parties find something in the book to uphold their views. In the order for the visitation of the sick, the priestly power of absolving is certainly maintained, and auricular confession is strongly recommended, at least, under certain circumstances. These matters favor the High Church views, and even on the subject of the Lord's Supper, High Churchmen find abundance of passages which teach the real presence, though Low Churchmen maintain that this doctrine is therein repudiated. At all events it is evident that the only unity to be found in the Church of England is "divided against itself." Such a kingdom, our Lord says, "shall not stand."

These divisions are the more remarkable, at a time when it is actually spoken of as a very probable event of the near future that the Church of England will form a union with Presbyterians, Methodists, etc. To an outsider it would certainly appear advisable to settle its intrinsic and apparently irreconcilable dissensions, before arranging to bring in other causes of disagreement.

DEATH OF MR. JAMES LOGUE.

In our obituary column we this week regretfully announce the death of Mr. James Logue, of Maniwaki, Quebec. In the demise of this estimable gentleman that district of country has suffered a loss of the most severe character and one that will be keenly felt for many years to come. We beg to tender our most sincere condolences to the relatives of the good and noble-hearted gentleman who is now numbered amongst the departed.

THE TORONTO SEPARATE SCHOOL ELECTION.

The election of a trustee for the representation of St. Andrew's Ward on the Catholic Separate School Board of Toronto took place on the 25th ult., to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Mr. Nolan. On behalf of those who have been raising an agitation to introduce the ballot into the Separate School elections, Mr. S. Danbar was put forward as a candidate. The Hon. T. W. Anglin was nominated on behalf of those who support the views of His Grace the Archbishop in opposition to the introduction of the ballot, and generally in favor of preserving the moral influence of the clergy in the management of the Separate Schools. The weakness of the agitation in favor of introducing changes in the manner of voting for Catholic School trustees may be judged from the result of this election. Mr. Anglin received 170 votes, Mr. Danbar 75. Of course, if Mr. Danbar had been elected, the effect would have been appealed to as proving that the ballot is asked for by the Catholic people, but as he was defeated, the *Globe* and the *Mail* infer that they need the ballot to enable them to record their votes freely. Some of Mr. Danbar's supporters asserted that they can vote the election

on the ground of spiritual intimidation, but as there is no proof forthcoming that any intimidation was used, it is probable that there will be no attempt at a protest. For the information of the Toronto dailies we may say, the Catholic electors are quite able to deal with the management of the Catholic Schools, without the paternal protection which these journals, unasked, are so ready to extend.

AN OMINOUS RUPTURE.

Lord Randolph Churchill created great sensation and surprise in the house by his speech on the bill of Mr. James I. Carew, M. P. for North Kildare, to grant County Government in Ireland in local matters, through Councils elected by the people. He said the Government had pledged itself in 1886 to extend to Ireland the same local liberty which is enjoyed in England, and on that pledge the Union party was formed. If the Government relied merely upon the executive power, if it were going to preach that the Irish must be looked upon as inferiors, it might hold that position for a time, but not for long. When the division was taken on the bill, Lord Randolph and several Conservatives and Unionists left the House to avoid voting. The bulk of the Liberal Unionists voted with Mr. Chamberlain against the bill, which was rejected 161 to 282 against 195. It is evident that but a slender cord binds Sir Randolph to the Salisbury Combination.

THE POPE'S WEEDS.

With a great flourish of trumpets it has been announced that "a brilliant diglory of the Roman Catholic Church, an honored confidant of the Pope," etc., has been converted to the Protestant Episcopal creed, and on the authority of the New York *Herald* the Canadian papers announce the great importance of the conversion, as the individual concerned "writes, by Papal authority, the following distinguishing designations after his name. Honorary Private Chamberlain of His Holiness, Leo XIII., Honorary Canon of St. Michael Archangel, Rome; Honorary Canon of the Metropolitan Church of Rheims, Commander of the Order of the Holy Sepulchre, Member of the Académie des Arts, and President General of the Society of the Advocates de St. Pierre in North America."

The Rev. Leo Boulard is the name of this priest who writes after his name so many titles. He publishes in the papers a letter in which he states that he no longer believes in the Syllabus of doctrines promulgated by Pope Pius IX., nor in the decrees of the Vatican Council, but that he finds a truly Apostolic and Nicene Church in the Protestant Episcopal Church in America, and to this Church he gives his adhesion, though he gives us plainly to understand that if he were in Europe he would attach himself to one of those schismatical bodies which become separated from the Catholic Church on lesser grounds than the distinguishing Protestant Episcopal from the Catholic Church: the Jansenists of Utrecht, to wit, or the Old Catholics under Dr. Dollinger or Father Hyacinth, in fact, to any schismatical association which would set up the standard of revolt against the Pope.

It was, long ago, a saying of Dean Swift that when the Pope threw his weeds out of his garden, over the fence, they fell into the garden of the English Church, and took root there. It seems, from the great demonstrations of joy with which this Rev. Leo Boulard is received, that such weeds are treasured as valuable flowers still. It is remarkable that among the thousands of prominent conversions which have been made to the Catholic Church within the memory of this generation, there are numbered the most learned, the most pious and the most zealous of the English Church clergy, while on the other hand, those who have abandoned the Catholic faith, few as they are in number, have been they who had to be subjected to severe discipline on account of serious faults against morality.

We are not sufficiently acquainted with the past history of Rev. Leo Boulard to state the circumstances which have given him this new light. In the Catholic Directory he does not appear with any distinctive titles whatsoever, which would lead to the belief that he was in any way distinguished above his confreres. He seems to have been one of the assistant priests of Boston Cathedral for some time, but we are informed that for some five years he has had no spiritual charge. For this there is probably some cause of which the Most Reverend Archbishop Williams of Boston is cognizant, but of which we are at present not aware. One thing, at all events, is certain, that among Catholics he did not occupy the very high distinctions which he is endeavoring to secure among the Protestant Episcopalians. It is usually the case when priests become unfaithful, which happens very seldom, that a woman has something to do with the matter. It was so from the time of Luther down to that of Father Hyacinth, and it may fairly be presumed that there is a marriage in view in the present case also.

The Brooklyn *Epoch* says: "The renowned

endeavor to make them concern others by rushing into print with them is a suspicious fact," and continues, "He seeks to attract more notice by leaving the Roman Catholic Church, than he ever attracted by belonging to it. The possible woman in the case has not yet been disclosed."

The New York *Herald's* account of the matter throws some light on the motives which may have influenced Mr. Boulard. It states that there is already a general dissatisfaction arising against Father Hyacinth, because of his monarchical ideas, and that in all probability the money which flowed so freely to help the Hyacinthian Church will be transferred to Rev. Mr. Boulard, if he will only start an old Catholic Church in France on his own hook. This prospect may have been a strong inducement. But even as Father Hyacinth has grown stale, Mr. Boulard, who lacks Father Hyacinth's ability, will also become stale, in much quicker time than it took Father Hyacinth to decline in popularity.

THE MUSKOKA JUDGESHIP.

The name of Mr. John O'Meara of Peterborough, Barister, has been mentioned in connection with the new Judgeship for Muskoka and Parry Sound. His appointment would give general satisfaction, as he has earned for himself a wide reputation for honesty and ability. We hope that Mr. O'Meara may be appointed to the position, which we have every confidence he will fill ably and creditably.

GREY NUNS' BAZAAR.

Those of our readers who have received tickets for the Grey Nuns' Bazaar, Ottawa, are requested to make returns without delay. We trust that all our friends will prove that they take interest in the erection of the Chapel of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, in the Dominion capital, and demonstrate that interest by generously responding to the appeal made on behalf of this pious undertaking.

THOROLD BAZAAR.

The grand drawing of prizes, as previously announced, will take place on the 31st of this month. Persons holding tickets and who have not yet returned the duplicates are requested to kindly do so before the date of drawing. The prizes to be drawn for are numerous, various, choice, and many very valuable. The Thorold Bazaar promises to be the finest ever held in Ontario.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

CHICAGO Protestant Churches are debating vigorously on the admission of colored persons.

THE Rev. Vernon Russell, late Protestant curate at Ardoyne, near Tallow has been received into the Catholic Church. Last July Mr. Russell put his resignation in the hands of his bishop and left Ardoyne with a view of preparing for his reception into the Catholic Church. He is a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, and the son of an eminent medical doctor in Tipperary.

WHILE the Rev. M. Baxter, a Church of England minister celebrated for his prophetic utterances founded on the Book of Daniel, was lecturing at Hope Hall in Liverpool, on the 8th ult., he stated incidentally that next year Home Rule will be an accomplished fact. Large numbers of the audience immediately cheered him lustily, and would not allow the lecturer to proceed until they had manifested their thorough sympathy with the cause of Ireland.

THE London Ontario CATHOLIC RECORD, under the editorial supervision of both Rev. Fathers Coffey and Northgrave, is one of the best of our exchanges, and we can always find something well worth copying from its columns, falling not only to give due credit always. We suppose must have been from inadvertence, that the RECORD failed to give credit April 14, for an original article, written expressly for the *Columbian*, entitled "Neglected Graces," or "Reminiscences of a Rector."—*Catholic Columbian*.

We thank our co-laborer for his kindly remarks concerning the RECORD, and we feel much pleasure in attesting also the ability with which the *Columbian* is conducted. We have frequently had occasion to edify our readers with extracts from that journal, and it has been our practice to give due credit. Our failure to do this with regard to the article on "Neglected Graces" was certainly an oversight, for which we offer our apology to our confreres. We deem it right to add that Rev. Father Northgrave is now the editor of the RECORD, Father Coffey having been transferred to another sphere of labor.

NEW BOOKS.

"Maria Magnificata," by Rev. Richard F. Clarke, S. J., editor of *The Month*. This excellent little work is especially adapted to devotions of the present month. New York: Benziger Bros., 36 and 38 Barclay street. Price 15 cents; \$1.00 per hundred.

"Six Sermons on Devotion to the Sacred Heart," by Rev. E. Bierbaum, translated by Miss Ella McMahon. The original work proved highly successful in Europe and we believe that this translation will be of great value to both priest and layman. New York: Benziger Bros., 36 and 38 Barclay street. Price 60 cents.

THE STATUE QUESTION.

SERMON BY REV. FATHER CALLAGHAN IN ST. PATRICK'S CHURCH, MONTREAL.

At the ten o'clock Mass which was celebrated on Sunday last in St. Patrick's church, Montreal, all the pews were filled to their utmost capacity and no standing room in the aisles was seen unoccupied. The Rev. Martin Callaghan ascended the pulpit and preached from the Gospel according to St. John. He explained the nature of sanctifying grace and enlarged upon the effects which it produces. At a certain stage of his sermon he remarked: "In this connection I am perhaps expected to say something in reference to a subject which is considerably exercising the public mind and calculated, in the designs of Providence, to elicit much good by promoting the cause of Catholicity. There has been a project formed of erecting a statue of the Blessed Virgin upon Mount Royal park. Is it advisable that this project should be realized? It might be some presumptions on my part to pronounce upon the propriety of such a statue, but the question of advisability, I might ask whether the erection of such a statue would be unjustifiable on principle. Not a few persons assert that it would be unjustifiable, and in making this assertion they exhibit an almost incredible amount of the crudest ignorance, the most glaring inconsistency, and the intensest bigotry. We are living in the nineteenth century—a century which boasts of its enlightenment and of the manifold wonders which it has achieved. One would imagine that at least the people of nowadays should neither speak nor write but of what they know—should never affirm but what they can prove. Such, however, is not the case when there is a question of the Catholic Church. She is the victim of misrepresentation and illogicalness. Her claims and teachings are shamefully ignored and disregarded. She is held responsible for odious facts of history in which she was not implicated, and for daily crimes with which she is not officially connected. She is charged with doctrines which she indignantly repudiates. When Christ was dying upon the Cross, He implored His Father to pardon His executioners: 'Forgive them; they know not what they do.' His faithful and immortal spouse, cognate to the slanders which are heaped forth on all sides to the prejudice of the original and ever-loving Mother of our Divine Redeemer, forever pray that God will forgive her legion of vile detractors, because they know not what they say. We are generally reputed to divinize her, but we do nothing of the kind. We are accused of worshipping statues and investing them with a virtue which they do not possess. The accusation devoid of all foundation. We are neither idolaters nor superstitiously inclined. Our church has never incultured, sanctioned or tolerated anything that might savor of idolatry or superstition. To her discredit and disadvantage, the 8th Commandment is violated repeatedly and unthinkingly. 'Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.' A certain clerical, decorating himself with the title of Bishop, is advertised to establish a fact which nobody will dispute. He is prepared to prove with overwhelming evidence that Christ never intended that His Mother should be worshipped. All Catholics join with Protestants in holding that he never had such an intention. The rev. gentleman would set more wisely to change his programme, and regale his hearers with a few chapters of Butler's short catechism, which contains most invaluable information. He would then do some good, or at least escape from a heavy expenditure of uselessly spent time and misplaced physical energy. He should be advised to desist from entertaining his audience with hackneyed objections that he has triumphantly answered a myriad of times. Protestants in their attitude towards the Blessed Virgin are glaringly inconsistent. They are quite satisfied to call a street of this city by a name which we give her, and in calling this street by this name they do great honor. They allude to Notre Dame street, or the street of Our Lady. Yet they are supremely dissatisfied and enraged at the idea that we should honor her in another way—by means of a statue. They dedicate their churches to our saints. After an experience of three hundred years they have not yet any of their own. Protestantism has not given birth to a single saint and is now scrupulous in pilfering from our calendars whatever saints they fancy and would like to adopt. They dedicate their churches to Saint Andrew, St. James, St. Thomas, St. Bartholomew, St. Martin, St. George, and by dedicating their churches to these saints, they honor them, though they may not intend to do so. How strange! They will not suffer us to honor by a statue one who surpasses all the saints in holiness. A person who enjoyed the plenitude of grace and in whose heart the Lord resided in a most special manner. Protestantism pretend that they follow the Bible, but they are far from following it. They follow it when it suits them, or rather it is themselves they follow. They are in open contradiction to what this divine book inspires. According to the Bible they should be like the Archangel Gabriel, who, in the hour of trial, was loyal to the Most High and delivered the message with which he was entrusted in accents of the most respectful affection. Saluting Mary, he exclaimed: 'Hail full of grace, the Lord is with thee, blessed art thou among women.' They will not be like this celestial ambassador, but would prefer to speak of an unfaithful and fallen angel spoken of in Genesis and to whom God said: 'I will put enmities between thee and the woman, and thy seed and her seed: she shall crush thy head.' In accordance with Holy Writ we should imitate Elizabeth, the spouse of Zachariah and the mother of John the Baptist. How proud and delighted she felt receiving a visit from her cousin, the Blessed Virgin—'Whence is this to me? The Mother of my Lord should come to me! Blessed art thou among women and blessed is the fruit of thy womb. Protestants would rather make com-