

GLADSTONE'S PROTEGES

Unmasked by T. Healy, M.P.

BRILLIANT AND UNSWATERABLE SPEECH.

The House of Commons Applauds.

MASTERY EXPLORE OF THE GOVERNMENT'S DOINGS

The Lash Applied with Telling Effect

TO THE WRETCHES WHO ADMINISTER THE LAW IN IRELAND.

The member for Monaghan resumed the adjourned debate on Mr. Sexton's amendment to the address, representing that it is essential to the public interest that the Criminal Law should be impartially administered to all classes in Ireland.

Mr. Healy said that every one would agree who had witnessed the exciting scene before the close of last sitting that it was much more decorous to have the reply of the Chief Secretary to-day. They were very anxious to know what his view was of recent occurrences in Ireland, and what policy he intended to pursue, or if he was simply pitchedforked into office to serve to be fired at by questions as a kind of Ministerialist "Aunt Sally." The late Chief Secretary made last night a speech which he regarded as very remarkable. The House and the country must remember that it was because of their attack upon the Government in reference to James Ellis French that the President of the Board of Trade charged them with acting the part of savage warriors, and with making use of "poisoned wells and explosive bullets." He wished for a moment to contrast the attitude of the Chancellor of the Duchy last night with his attitude upon the same subject some three months previously. Last night James Ellis French was "this wretch," "a fellow," "one who if the Government had anything to do with him would lose them the support of honest and honorable men." Three months ago, when the Irish members showed that so far back as September, 1883, James Ellis French committed perjury in saying he had not been removed from office, Mr. Trevelyan backed him up, screened the perjury, and hoped he would recover and be able to proceed with his action against the hon. member for Mallow.

The ex-Chief Secretary's speech was practically a statement for the plaintiff in the libel action of French vs. O'Brien, which was to take place a few days later in Dublin. But in spite of that carefully prepared statement Corwall was practically convicted by a jury of his "chama." With the full knowledge that French was then swearing perjury for the purpose of defeating the action of the hon. member for Mallow the Government deliberately kept silence, and it was only when driven by the force of public opinion, and when French could not be spurred or kicked into going on with his action, that the right hon. gentleman admitted he had been removed. If the Government had only had the common honesty to acknowledge that French had committed perjury, and to have treated him as a perjurer, some satisfaction would have been given. The Irish party wanted to know from the new Chief Secretary was he prepared to back up these wretches in the same way as his predecessor had done? Would he imitate his predecessor, and with the knowledge that willful perjury had been committed in the interests of the Crown to crush an opponent, would he back up those guilty officials? It was time that the hon. gentleman should speak out. It was time that they should have a distinct statement of the intentions of the Government (Irish cheers). Would the hon. gentleman liberate his soul on the subject?

Bolton's Qualifications for Office.

Since the accession to office by the hon. gentleman an announcement had been made that George Bolton had been reinstated. In his (Mr. Healy's) opinion that argued very badly for the future career of the hon. gentleman. The new Chief Secretary knew that, on the certificate of an English judge, George Bolton was declared to be guilty of the most heartless conduct in swindling his own wife of £40,000. He knew that an Irish judge—Judge Walsh—in the Bankruptcy Court condemned his conduct as notorious. He knew that in the Sligo murder case Judge Barry commented most strongly in words of condemnation on Bolton's conduct in concealing a deposition of the mother of the murderer. He knew that Judge Barry, in the case of Bolton against O'Brien, commented afresh on Bolton's conduct, and that in the Maamtrasna case, when the important and vital depositions were withheld, George Bolton was the solicitor that appended to the statement of Patrick Joyce in the Crown brief the statement, "This boy survived, but his evidence is worthless." The Irish party asked the new Chief Secretary whether with these facts before him—with this swindler and bankrupt and keeper-back of depositions—with this record before his eyes, was this the way to conciliate the Irish people by protecting and reinstating this man after his suspension? (Irish cheers.) In the Sligo case, in which Judge Barry commented on the withholding of the important depositions, the judge had to use the prisoner's counsel's brief to supply the absence of the document, which, as his lordship said, "should have been in the custody of the Clerk of the Crown; and

Judge Barry, commenting on the proceedings, said it was "one of the most remarkable episodes in his experience of criminal administration;" and further that—

"It was eminently unsatisfactory, and one with reference to which the feeling of a judge could not be realised. It was a terrible thing that in a trial involving human life a document that should have been in court was not forthcoming."

(Irish cheers.) The judge also observed upon the fact that "the original document had disappeared" (Irish cheers). Then they had the suppression of documents in the Maamtrasna case, and the wife-swindling by George Bolton.

The bankruptcy proceedings were unduly and illegally postponed, over and over again, contrary to the statute. And why? To give Bolton an opportunity of waiting for the result of the Belfast trials. The section of the Act under which the bankruptcy proceedings took place provided that "after the granting of an order for protection, the Court shall appoint a private sitting to be held forthwith." That, however, was not done. The Act also provided that the petitioning creditor, ten days before the private sitting, should file a full account of his debts, and yet, from the last of May, when George Bolton filed his petition, down to September nothing was done, Bolton running his chance of getting a verdict against the hon. member for Mallow. Why did the Government take this extraordinary course in reference to such a man? They made the arrangements with him because they were afraid of him (loud Irish cheers). When he put the question to the Solicitor-General whether Bolton would be dismissed or not, the reply was that the matter was of such a serious character and of such importance that it should lie over until the Chief Secretary took his seat. At that time the Government evidently had not made up their minds. But in the meanwhile a very remarkable letter from James Ellis French came to light—a letter in which he said, referring to the Government officials, that if he took a certain course he would "perhaps see some of them in the dock."

Bolton's Grip on Spencer.

While the Government were considering what it would do with George Bolton, French writes his letter, not for publication (hear, hear), but it comes to light; the Maamtrasna, debate took place, the Irish members were voted down, and, of course, the Government knew that Bolton could, if he chose, put this House of Commons to shame and turn Lord Spencer out of Ireland (Irish cheers). George Bolton had only to come forward in the position of a repentant culprit, and of course he had Lord Spencer in the hollow of his hand (cheers). Bolton knew too much—in fact, for the past two or three months since his suspension he had been going about threatening what he would do if the Government dismissed him. One thing he said he would do was that he would not oblige Earl Spencer by making a bankrupt of the hon. member for Mallow, as he had been treated badly by the Government. He said he had performed jury-packing, had had men hanged by the connivance of Earl Spencer, and he would expose the Government if he was thrown over, and so the Government did not throw him over (Irish cheers). George Bolton put a pistol to Earl Spencer's head, loaded it—he might use the metaphor—with the blood of innocent men, charged it with the knowledge of unwholesome and fatal secrets, and so the Government put back Bolton—a man branded with the guilt of the most odious crime by English and Irish judges (Irish cheers). This was the man with whose appointment the new Chief Secretary opened his official career in Ireland. The House, with an Act admitting the most ferocious character in the country as the way to obtain the confidence of the people to put the administration of the Act into the hands of the most unworthy and the filthiest instruments? Were they to be told that when the highest men the Crown had administering the Act finding out criminals in Ireland, and packing juries, were men of tainted character, of loathsome lives, men with whom no one in decent society, or with a shred of self-respect would be seen, and with reference to one of whom the late Chief Secretary said it was a monstrous charge against him to say that he was even seen with or had spoken to him—Mr. Trevelyan stupidly provokes a crushing retort.

Mr. Trevelyan—I rise to order. This is certainly very strong (ironical Irish cheers). French had no more to do with the packing of juries than the police-constables at Scotland Yard.

Mr. Healy—If I was inclined to comment on the interruption I would say it is as irregular an interruption as ever I heard (Irish cheers). As it had been made, however, he would just say something on the point. Honorable members might remember the case of Poff and Barrett, who were tried for the murder of Brown. There was no evidence against them but that of an old haridan, a woman of bad character, named Bridget Broghanan, who, at the inquest, swore she did not know who committed the crime, but having been in the hands of the police for some time, said it was done by Poff and Barrett. What did French say about it in his letter?—"You are not up in criminal cases, and Orr has not had practical experience in heavy cases. But I have had, and perhaps there are very few who could work up a case for the Crown or the defence more closely than I could, as John Arkinson and Peter O'Brien said to me in Mary Broghanan's case, in which I had about seventy witnesses, that they never saw a case worked up closer to the wind than it was (Irish cheers)."

The two men charged in that case, the night before their execution in their cells, left a declaration declaring before God that they were innocent of the crime, and that was the case which the man now in custody on a charge of beastly and abominable offences had "worked up" for the Crown, and with reference to which Mr. Peter O'Brien said he never saw a case worked up closer to the wind (Irish cheers). No wonder they loved British rule. No wonder they should be in

ecstasies at the gentlemen sent over to them. No wonder they should bow down before those creatures engaged in nameless crimes in high places—men like French, described as a filthy wretch by the gentleman who defended so long. Their charge was that having had a Coercion Act passed, care was taken on the part of the under it to exclude every Catholic, especially in murder cases, whilst in grave cases which, according to the statement of Crown counsel, involved the commission of the most odious crimes that could be committed, they connived at an acquittal. This Act gave power to the prisoner to call for a special jury, but no prisoner before Corwall ever thought of taking that step. The panel was drawn, consisting of people of high rating. It was admitted by the late Chief Secretary that George Bolton sent the panel a few days in advance to Mr. Welch, the secretary of the Tory Club in Dublin, and he marked off the politics and creed of every juror upon it. In the case of the county panel, the Royal Irish Constabulary did the same, and by this means the Crown made up their minds in advance as to who the persons were who would be on the jury.

"Fair Play."

How did they manipulate them? In the case of Myles Joyce they challenged 28—all Catholics; in the case of Francis Hynes they challenged 26—all of them Catholics; in the case of Thomas Higgins, for the Lough Mask murder, they challenged 54; in the case of Pat Higgins, 42; in the case of Pat Poole, 37; and in the case of Joe Poole, 47. Consequently all of these men were hanged (ironical cheers from the Irish members). That showed that the Crown manipulated the panel, in order to get the type of persons they required to find the verdicts they desired. Yet that was called fair play (ironical cheers). Would such a system be tolerated for a moment in England? He ventured to say that if the Claimant had been found guilty by a jury so composed there was not a Magna Charta association in the land that would not at the present moment be alleging that the Claimant was unjustly convicted. How much more would the Irish people entertain this opinion, knowing as they did that the panel was unfairly juggled, and that the whole machinery of Government was against them (cheers).

A Contrast.

What did the Crown do in the case of French and Corwall? The jury in French's and Corwall's case was a special jury. The action of the Crimes Act on that point appeared to have been drawn with a prophetic eye for the benefit of gentlemen like these. Out of a panel of 200 there were only 45 Catholics. It might, therefore, be supposed that the Crown, knowing that French and Corwall were Freemasons of high rank, would make use of that process of elimination which they practised on other occasions to so unlimited an extent. They did nothing of the kind. No proclamation was made from the bench that the panel would be called over on heavy fines as was done in every agrarian case. The consequence was that Mr. Corwall's Freemason friends, in obedience to a whip, came into court, and the Catholics, knowing they would not be fined, remained away in order to avoid being present at a disgusting trial. Mr. Corwall had the right of twenty challenges, and he was easily enabled to eliminate all the Catholics. What did the Government do? They did not challenge a single person (ironical cheers). How admirable! They challenged 54 in the case of Thomas Higgins; 42 in the case of Pat Higgins; 47 in the case of Joe Poole, but none at all in the case of Mr. Corwall, who is accused of a crime that they were told in Holy Writ cried to heaven for vengeance. Oh, yes, it did not cry to Dublin Castle for vengeance (ironical cheers). Were they told by the Crown, as in the case of the poor country peasants who were struggling to remain in the homes of their fathers, that as the existing law did not reach these blackguards the Government would bring in a new Bill (hear, hear). No. They were not told the jurors were in sympathy with crime, and that the Government would take care to provide machinery for putting the proper men into the box (hear, hear). It was not for him to charge the Freemasons of Dublin with sympathizing with abominable offences; but if he put the same construction upon their action that the Government did upon the action of common jurors in agrarian cases, he would be inclined to say that the eleven Freemasons who acquitted their fellow Mason in Dublin last week held very peculiar views on the subject of nameless crimes (hear, hear).

(Continued on Fifth Page.)

THE CATHOLICS IN GERMANY.

HOLDING THE BALANCE OF POWER IN THE REICHSRAT.

BERLIN, Nov. 21.—The Reichstag will open to-morrow, and more than usual interest attaches to the coming session. The recent elections have not strengthened the hands of the Chancellor, and the possible political combinations form a lively subject for discussion. In the present Parliament the Catholic party, having gained two votes, number 100, and with the Guelphs eight, Poles sixteen, and Alsatians fifteen, count a total of 139 votes, and they again hold the balance of power, and will be able to decide either way. Both Conservative parties with the Catholics count 240 votes, while the Catholics with the opposition Liberals and Democrats can muster a vote of 238. These figures present vast problems; but the entire interest will depend upon the action of the Chancellor as to whether he will, in order to obtain the forty votes required to give him a clear majority, join with the Catholics and grant the rather exacting concessions which their press demand, or with the Liberals and enforce the anti-Catholic policy embodied in the Falk laws, or cut the Gordian knot by an immediate dissolution of the Reichstag.

An attachment for \$2,000 has been issued against the property of Col. J. H. Mapleson, the political manager.

THE PLENARY COUNCIL.

COMMENCEMENT OF THE SECOND WEEK'S PROCEEDINGS—IMPRESSIONS OF SERVICES.

BALTIMORE, Md., Nov. 16.—The second week of the third Plenary Council began on Sunday with impressive services in the Cathedral. The scene when the vast audience was gathered there was similar to that of the first Sunday. It was possibly increased in splendor by the greater variety in the colors of the vestments worn. Gargantuanly trimmed copes and white and gold mitres were in pleasing contrast to the sombre cassocks and surplices worn by the priests.

Archbishop Williams, of Boston, robed in vestments of gold and wearing the episcopal gloves and slippers of purple, celebrated the Pontifical Mass. For an aged prelate he has a remarkably strong voice, almost every note being clear and distinct. Archbishop Elder, of Cincinnati, who is a native of this city, preached an able sermon on the noble office of the priesthood.

THE SECOND SESSION.

After the sermon the second solemn session of the Council began. Archbishop Gibbons left his throne and took his seat before the main altar. His mitre was removed, but he retained his crozier, holding it in his left hand, till he rose. A psalm was sung by the choir and a prayer recited by the Archbishop. This was followed by the Litany of the Saints, which was rendered by the choir, and another prayer by the Apostolic Delegate.

The Council was then opened by the Rev. Dr. Foley. Upon permission of the Apostolic Delegate he put to the assembled high clergy the preliminary question whether they were prepared to give their final opinion on the decrees the formulation of which had been completed through the grace of God and their own clemency in discussion. The answer given from each side of the sanctuary was affirmative. Dr. O'Connell, a secretary of the Council, then called the roll.

THE FORMULATED DECREES.

Mr. Corcoran then rising, asked again whether the clergy were pleased to deliberate, and receiving an affirmative answer read the decrees as formulated as follows:—

Decree No. 1.—Concerning the Catholic faith. A solemn and detailed profession of faith will hereafter be required of all who enter upon the sacred ministrations of the Church.

Decree No. 2.—Concerning Christian missionaries. They are to be subordinate to a greater degree than has hitherto been the case to their natural superiors, the members of the episcopacy.

Decree No. 3.—Concerning our Apostolic Vicars. The decrees embraced the conduct of these functionaries in whatsoever relates to the spread of the faith as their chief office.

These decrees were all unanimously adopted.

REQUIREMENTS OF YOUNG CLERGYMEN.

A further chapter of resolutions specified the requirements that are henceforward to be made of those intending to enter the ministry of the Church. The title of this chapter is "Concerning the Examination of the Clergy." Greater age, longer time of theological study and greater actual learning will be necessary for admission to the priesthood.

Certain restrictions not hitherto strictly observed in relation to the celebration of the mass will be enforced, full force being given the Council's decision under a pertinent statute of Pope Innocent III. These resolutions were also unanimously adopted.

To-night Bishop Spaulding, of Peoria, preached in the Cathedral on the higher education of the priesthood.

BALTIMORE, Nov. 19.—A meeting of the Bishops in attendance at the Plenary Council was held last night to hear the report of the directors of the Irish Catholic colonization association concerning its work in the West. W. J. O'Connell, secretary, stated that the financial condition of the association demonstrated complete success. Colonies had been established in Nebraska and Minnesota, which were in a prosperous condition. Bishop Spaulding spoke of the moral and religious as well as the physical advantages of the effort now being made. He lamented the deplorable condition of many Irish people in large cities and pointed out the advantage of providing themselves with homes in the Great West. Bishop Ireland spoke of the effort to better the condition of the Irish people who bear an insignificant share in the colonizations of the West. If the present opportunity was not seized he said after a few years lands would be beyond the reach of the poorer classes. Bishops Marty, of Dakota, and Macabertus, of Denver, said there were great opportunities for poor people in their districts.

CLEVELAND, Nov. 19.—Bishop Gilmour will bring before the Plenary Council the question of vesting property holdings of the Church in the Bishops. Bishop Gilmour strongly favors the proposal.

BALTIMORE, Md., Nov. 21.—The Plenary Council resumed its secret sessions this morning and no intimation is given of what was transacted. This afternoon there was a conference at the cathedral, when some decrees were prepared to be voted on at the public session on Sunday. To-night Bishop Gross, of Savannah, preached on "The missions for the colored people," and Bishop Rademacher, of Nashville, on "Catholic schools, their necessity to the child and their influence on society." It is understood that a letter has been received by a member of the Council from the creditors of the late Archbishop Purcell, of Cincinnati, asking the aid of the Council in the liquidation of these claims, but it is doubtful if this body will take any action in the matter. On Thursday a reception will be given to the prelates and theologians of the Council by the Catholic benevolent legion of Maryland.

BRILLIANT RECEPTION TO THE BISHOPS AND CLERGY.

BALTIMORE, Md., Nov. 21.—The reception

to the visiting bishops and clergy of the Plenary Council here to-night was a brilliant success. The decorations of the Opera House, in which it was held, were very elaborate and made a charming contrast with the quiet habits of the bishops and the clergy. Besides a very large number of prominent Catholics of this city and Washington, there were present judges of the national, State and city courts, several Congressmen, the Mayor of Baltimore and a host of other prominent officials. The ladies were attired in walking costumes, while the gentlemen wore dress suits. Ex-Congressman William J. O'Brien, president, with Archbishop Gibbons, the Pope's representative, on his right and Archbishop Williams, of Boston, on his left.

ADDRESS OF WELCOME.

Judge William M. Merrick made the address of welcome. He started that if the assembly of any body of men, whether in science, politics, or industry, was an event of importance, much more so must be a Plenary Council, which was charged to consider the social, moral and spiritual welfare of the millions now existing and of the countless millions who are to come after them in this Republic, who will regulate their lives and frame their immortal hopes in accordance with the teachings of the Catholic Church. Speaking of the attitude of the Church toward the State he said nothing is more generally misunderstood than the teachings and the tendencies of the influence of the Catholic Church upon republican institutions, and doubtless this Council has been looked upon by many with pious alarm, lest it should provoke a congress convened to make provision for a new American form of government. Very many well-intentioned men fail to understand how loyalty to the State can co-exist with obedience to the Church, and simply because they do not know that the jurisdictional limits of the Church are rigorously confined to the domain of faith and morals. The Catholic clergy of this country have never interfered with its political institutions. Was there ever an occasion in which any portion of the Catholic clergy passed any resolve upon any political issue, or for or against any candidate for political power? During the late civil war the Catholic clergymen kept aloof from either side.

The speaker in conclusion referred to the sympathy of the church with our institutions and presented statistics showing the growth of the Catholic faith in this country.

Mr. Charles J. Bonaparte, a descendant of the great Napoleon, also greeted the distinguished assembly. In his address he compared the growth of Catholicity and the faith of the followers of the Church to the continued decline of the other religions and the increase of sceptics who claim to be scientists and philosophers.

Mr. Bonaparte said there were many reasons why even those opposed to the Catholic Church in faith should look upon the Plenary Council as an event of grave and joyful significance. At this moment the people of America have discharged the grave duty of choosing their chief ruler, and the assembling of this Council should recall to us the principles on which our polity is founded. The Catholic Church knows nothing of candidates or platforms, of tariffs or currencies, but she requires of men to vote with an unclouded judgment, with the good of the country as their motive, with the fear of God before their eyes. No man can be at once a good Catholic and a bad citizen.

REMARKS BY ARCHBISHOP WILLIAMS.

Archbishop Williams replied to the addresses of welcome. In the course of his remarks he thanked the Catholics of Baltimore for their genuine hospitality. He says it was fully in keeping with the reputation of the city in which lived the immortal Carroll, as the first Catholic Bishop of America.

The members of the Council had come to this city with different feelings from those which they would have experienced had they come to any other city. It was the home of the first Bishop and the first Archbishop of the Church in this country; and now they saw his successor surrounded by educated clergy and presiding over the third Plenary Council, which represented 8,000,000 of American Catholics. Great changes had taken place in the last seventy years.

A banquet was afterward served in the lower hall of the theatre, to which over five hundred persons sat down.

The public services at the Cathedral to-day were attended by a large congregation. After Pontifical High Mass, which was sung by Archbishop Heiss, of Milwaukee, a sermon on "De Sacerdotio" was preached in Latin by Archbishop Alemnay, of San Francisco.

In the afternoon a joint private session of bishops and theologians was held in the Cathedral, beginning at four o'clock and lasting two hours. Action on the decrees was postponed until next Sunday morning.

POSITION OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH ON THE PUBLIC SCHOOL QUESTION.

BALTIMORE, Md., Nov. 21.—The usual sessions of the Plenary Council were held to-day, and the work was so far advanced that at the solemn session to be held to-morrow it is expected that several more decrees will be formally adopted. One of these, it is thought probable, will be concerning the position of the Catholic Church on the public school question. Bishop McQuaid, of Rochester, N. Y., is one of the leading exponents of the position of the Church on this question, and there is no doubt that the action taken by the Council will be very positive and will not only demand that Catholic parents shall send their children to parish schools, but that a division of the school tax be made in every State and city commensurate with the proportion paid by Catholic taxpayers.

To-day a leading member of the Council said on this subject:—It is not many years since the columns of the press teemed with articles on the public school question. This has been a source of great annoyance to the leaders of the Catholic Church. In nearly every large city in the country a great number of Catholic children attend the public schools. Experience has taught that these children eventually become careless in the duties of their religion and indifferent to the high standard of morality on

which the Church places so high a value. Her bishops and clergy sternly advocate the daily catechism and stated instructions on the principal tenets of the Catholic faith. To bring about this result parish schools have been attached to many churches, where the poor children are educated. But Catholics are crippled by the want of pecuniary resources, and thus it happens that in some instances these parish schools are inferior in their curriculum to the public schools of our country. The bishops see that the only way for them to secure a thorough disciplining of the children according to Catholic belief and practice is to establish a more thorough system of parish schools in every city, the studies being graded on the same plan as the primary, grammar and high school courses of the country. For this purpose they demand such a division of the school tax as will enable them to place their schools on a level with the public schools. What means can be adopted for the accomplishment of this plan is a problem to be solved by the wisdom of the fathers of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore.

"To-night," says V. Ryan, of Buffalo, preached on the "Observation of Feasts," and took strong grounds against the desecration of the Sabbath. Bishop Krauthauer, of Green Bay, Wis., preached at St. Alphonsus' Church on the "Church in America," especially the German element.

WILL THE COUNCIL PASS UPON THE CLAIMS AGAINST ARCHBISHOP PURCELL?

BALTIMORE, Md., Nov. 23, 1884.—Archbishop Gibbons has received from Cincinnati an appeal from several of the creditors of the late Archbishop Purcell asking that the Plenary Council take some action looking to a settlement of that prelate's immense debts. It is not likely that the Council will take any definite action on this point, but it will probably call attention to the advice given to the prelates by the second Plenary Council not to engage in any banking business. Archbishop Elder, of Cincinnati, to-day said that some of the creditors kept writing insulting letters to the Pope and to himself, charging that he was holding back funds which should be distributed among them.

THE CLAIMS BEFORE THE COURTS.

He added:—"Shortly after the failure was first announced a subscription of some \$60,000 was raised in New York as a starter toward liquidating the entire debt which, it was then supposed, would not aggregate more than \$400,000. But when it was afterward learned that the total indebtedness largely exceeded that sum, every one concluded that it would be next to an impossibility to pay off the claims. The \$60,000 was then banked to await the decision of the courts which were appealed to, to determine the question whether or not the churches and Catholic institutions of the archdiocese were liable for debts contracted by the personal act of Archbishop Purcell through his agent and brother, Father Purcell. The Lower Court decided against such liability, and the creditors took an appeal. So matters were at last. I have been doing all I could to alleviate most of the distress among the depositors, particularly for the aged and sick, who had no means of support. Among all of whom I have consulted on the subject I have not found one who would advise me that I had a right to declare this a diocesan debt binding in justice."

THE CHURCH AND THE COLORED PEOPLE.

Bishop Gross, of Savannah, preached at the Cathedral to-night on the colored people of the South. In his sermon he said:—"Their present low moral standing, for which I cannot blame them, as they have not had the advantages of the whites, can be elevated by the Gospel preached by competent ministers. It is well known throughout the South that their ministers are men who, as a class, have but little education, and some of them make a travesty of religion. It is like the blind leading the blind. The Catholic Church is doing all she can to elevate the race by her teachings, but more money is needed for more extensive operations in this field."

THE REDISTRIBUTION BILL.

POLICY OF THE PRINCE OF WALES.

LONDON, Nov. 22.—The redistribution bill will not be introduced in the house of commons on Monday. No statements regarding the principles upon which it is constructed were made to parliament to-day. Mr. Chamberlain, president of the board of trade, held a private conference to-day with the radical members of the house of commons. He declined to state what course would be taken should Mr. Gladstone and Lord Salisbury agree on a scheme of redistribution. Rumors of discord in the cabinet and of the resignation of Mr. Chamberlain are discarded. Only a small group of extremists continue to attack the government. The Dispatch, a leading radical weekly, declares that: Gladstone makes a grievous blunder in his course on the franchise and redistribution bills, which will never be forgotten, and heralds the downfall of the government. The Prince of Wales has been entertaining Stanley, Collings and other advanced radicals at Sandringham palace. It is supposed the prince's intention is to influence their votes in favor of the government compromise and on the grant to Prince Albert.

LONDON, Nov. 21.—The Marquis of Salisbury is pressing Mr. Gladstone for a reduction in the number of Irish members in the House of Commons under the proposed redistribution bill. It is reported that Mr. Gladstone consents to reduce the number by five. A coalition between the extreme radicals and Parnellites in the House threatens the liberals with a large defection. The "Lords' abolition league" is arranging for a demonstration to protest against any compromise with the House of Lords.

The second floor of the Ottawa custom house fell on Saturday evening, there being several hundred barrels of apples placed thereon. On the lower floor were gin and brandy casks and other articles, which were smashed to pieces. The loss will be upwards of \$2,000. As the goods were in bond, the government will be the losers. The cause of the accident was due to the rickety condition of the floor.