

hostile Equal Rights who have the cry of Equal Rights on their lips, but who aim only at the total destruction of liberty of conscience as far as Catholics are concerned.

MR. MEREDITH'S POLICY.

We mentioned in a former issue that Mr. Meredith, the leader of the Ontario Opposition, in his speech at the Opera House in this city, in which he fore-shadowed the policy of his party, declared himself plainly against Catholic education in Catholic schools.

He asks why "should a public man, when he criticizes public legislation" on this subject, "be greeted with shouts of intolerance by any particular church, and should the no-Popery cry be raised against him?"

He here throws upon Catholics the odium of having raised the no Popery cry in Ontario. Mr. Meredith knows very well that this is a false representation. We maintain that the right now enjoyed by Catholics of establishing and supporting separate schools is no extraordinary concession. It is merely a recognition of the natural right which all parents possess, of giving their children a religious training if they deem it proper to do so. If Protestants prefer to turn religion out of the schools in which their children are to be educated, we are free to say we believe they make a great mistake, but we do not propose to force our opinions upon them. Our jurisdiction extends only to our own children, and as regards them no legislature has the right of declaring that we shall not be allowed to educate them morally and religiously. Though we are but a minority in the Province, we have a right to say how much or how little religious instruction shall be given in the schools to which our children shall be sent.

It is unnecessary for us to prove here that religious instruction in the schools is necessary for the proper training of children. Over and over again the Protestant clergy have declared this to be the case, both in Canada and the United States. A few days ago the Rev. Dr. Barrow, a prominent Congregational minister of San Francisco, Cal., and pastor of the First Congregational Church in that city, preached from his pulpit thus:

"We believe that we need more religion in our schools, not less. We assert, and reassert, that Protestantism should present a solid front in protesting against the secularization of our schools, or the attempt to rule out of account in school life the only thing God has ever accounted of value on earth."

The Presbytery of Manitoba has recently made a similar declaration, and the same clergyman who are anxious now to take from Catholics the right of religious education, have over and over again declared that they wish to make a certain amount of religious instruction compulsory in the public schools, so that they really desire to force upon Catholics such religious instruction as they see fit to arrange for themselves, while they would prevent us from having such as we ourselves desire. We ask no special favor. We demand only to be left free to devote our own money towards imparting to our own children such an education as we feel bound in conscience to impart. If Anglicans, Methodists or Presbyterians desired such a liberty, it would certainly be ungrudgingly granted to them. If these do not want it that is no reason why we should be deprived of it. It is not Catholics who have proclaimed that the war is a no-Popery war. The banner of no-Popery has been displayed by the Ministerial Associations, the Synods, the Presbyteries, the Orange lodges, and the anti-Catholic press, and Mr. Meredith's speech is a declaration that he will fight with that banner displayed.

Mr. Meredith cites what occurs in the United States as a pattern which ought if possible to be imitated by the people of Ontario. He says:

"Look across the border at the state of things. No separate schools from one end of the United States to the other. (Loud cheers.) They have thought it consistent with their views of right and justice to deny separate schools to the Roman Catholics of that country."

This is true, but what is the result? The Catholics of the United States will not be cheated of their right to impart a Christian education to their children, and 700,000 Catholic children are attending Catholic schools, at a cost of \$10,000,000 annually to the Catholic people, while they are paying about that same sum for the education of their Protestant neighbors' children, whose parents are not ashamed thus to make paupers of them. This is the state of affairs which Mr. Meredith would like to see introduced into Ontario; and from where the cheering came in, it is evident that his audience fully understood him.

It is true Mr. Meredith does not propose at present to abolish the separate school system. He tells us why he will not do this; it is because the charter of the Dominion, the Confederation Act, will not permit him to go so far. To do this would upset the Confederation Act, and would necessarily subject the Protestant schools of Lower Canada to a Catholic majority, while the Catholic schools of

Ontario were subjected to the Protestant majority of this Province. But Mr. Meredith finds that it is in the power of the Protestant majority here to render the Catholic schools, to some extent, inefficient, by harassing the separate school trustees with unnecessary labor, and by taking advantage of every possible oversight of Catholic ratepayers, to deprive the separate schools of their taxes, and throw them into the common school fund. The leader of a great party thinks it worth his while to agitate the Province from end to end with no nobler purpose than this in view. If all Mr. Meredith asks in regard to new separate school legislation were carried in the legislature to-morrow, this is all that it would effect. Is this the utmost that a great statesman can do for the benefit of his country? Surely "the mountain in labor brings forth a ridiculous mouse."

That we do not underestimate Mr. Meredith's statesmanship on this subject will be seen from the following sentence from his speech:

"My position is the same as that which was assumed by the leading men in Ontario at the time of the passage of the Act in 1850. While admitting they have the right to separate schools, I say the man would be a traitor to his country who would open the door to the extension and development of these schools in Ontario beyond what is their absolute right."

The policy is, therefore, a policy of repression. It is a policy against which the Catholics of Ontario will of necessity set their faces. It is a policy which can be heartily endorsed only by fanatics of the Sam Hughes stripe, who thus speak of it in the last Victoria Warder, capitals and all:

"The Warder congratulates him on his magnificent effort, and willingly follows him into action. The address to the army is grand; the troops are inspired and ready to advance; and in BATTLE is where men must show the courage of their convictions. Let Mr. Meredith boldly sound the advance; when not only those wearing the old time Liberal Conservative uniform, but also thousands of independent Reformers will join their standards with his, and all march on to victory."

"Action should now be the order." On this specimen of literature the Globe of Monday has the appropriate remark:

"This is something like writing. It stirs the heart like the sound of a tuba and drum band of O. Y. B. 273. Modesty makes us hesitate about suggesting any improvement in the plan of campaign. But how would this do for a war cry?"

"Down with the Bilingual Baby Books."

FEROCIOUS HYPOCRISY.

The London Free Press is shocked at Archbishop Cleary for styling the Equal Rights leaders "ferocious bigots." With out attempting to prove a negative, or to palliate the insane and ferocious conduct of the Hunters, the Wilds, and others, who for the last nine months, have been "tiring up the members of fanatical intolerance," the Free Press attempts to preach a lesson of politeness and mild forbearance to His Grace of Kingston. Instead of advising its friend and patron, Mr. Meredith, to apologize for having falsely attributed to the Archbishop words and sentiments that were not his, the Free Press endeavors to take all the odium from the maligners and excite public indignation against the Archbishop, who is both slandered and maligned. "If all the public teachers," says the Free Press, "were to imitate the license and impudent liberty he (the Archbishop) has thought fit to indulge in towards Protestants, mud-throwing would be a settled institution in the country." The Free Press knows only too well that there was no use to wait for Archbishop Cleary to open the campaign of mud-throwing, because he dares to defend himself against the unjust imputations of Mr. W. R. Meredith. The mud-throwing has been in active operation in London and Toronto and all over this now excited Province for many years, but more especially during the whole period of the agitation on the Jesuits Estate Act. Did the fanatics confine themselves to mud-throwing we could bear it all with silence and equanimity. But foul and atrocious charges were hurled from the pulpit week after week against every Catholic and especially against the Jesuit Fathers, acknowledged to be among the most pious, most learned, and most worthy to be revered of the priests of the Catholic Church. One leading preacher in Toronto, after charging them with every crime, declared that they might with impunity be shot down on the street. Another said the whole system of the Catholic Church was a "Mystery of Iniquity." Bishop Carman has been filling the columns of the Mail, week after week for months, with appeals to the passions of the bigots to stand up in their might and wipe out Jesuitism at once and for ever. These "ferocious" onslaughts from the press and the pulpit by leading Protestant ecclesiastics were suffered in silence and allowed to pass, by the London Free Press, who now shows so much indignation at the Archbishop's eloquent defence of himself and vigorous denunciation of Mr. Meredith's wanton and unscrupulous appeals to Protestant

bigotry. The London Free Press is quite too innocent by far not to know full well that with his people "mud-throwing has been long a settled institution in this country." The hypercity of the Free Press is too glaring not to be noticed by all, and treated with utter contempt. The disgusted public are fully cognizant of the fact that when the preachers got tired of mud-throwing and the respectable congregations grew sick and nauseated with the same dirty and ferocious platitudes repeated every week, that mud-throwers of an improved character were imported, some from Montreal and some from bigoted Boston, to keep up the interest and draw the crowds and the pennies. Rev. Mr. Campbell of Montreal, who stigmatized the priests "as making money out of dead men's bones"—the apostate Chiquiqui, who accused the Catholics of being all thieves and murderers—the gross and licentious Fulton, who shocked the community with horrible details of impure ruffianism that would not be tolerated in a third class bar-room—all these ferocities were invoked and let loose upon an unflinching public, and rancor, hatred and vengeance stirred up in the hearts of Protestants against their Catholic neighbors, and the Free Press was silent. All its pent up indignation was reserved for Archbishop Cleary. Shame upon such unjust and outrageous hypocrisy!

MR. MEREDITH CALLED TO ACCOUNT.

We publish this week the three letters which have passed between His Grace Archbishop Cleary and Mr. W. R. Meredith, and will continue to give place to the other letters as they appear:

Archbishop Cleary to Mr. Meredith.
The Palace, Kingston,
Dec. 18th, 1889.

To W. R. Meredith, Esq., Q. C. M. P. P.:
DEAR SIR—The public journals of this Province report you as having made the following reference in your speech on Monday night in the Grand Opera House in London:

"I take from a newspaper published in the city of Kingston, addressed, it is true, to the readers of the paper, but arising out of matters that engage the attention of the Province; the words are used by a newspaper, but, to some extent, I apprehend, by the gentleman who presides over the Archdiocesan See at Kingston."

"Holding, as we do, the balance of power between the two factions, we are, if only true to ourselves and to the crisis about to come upon us, independent of either, and can disstate the terms up in which one or other shall receive our support."

May I take the liberty of requesting you to inform me and my fellow-citizens of Ontario by what authority you publicly attribute to me the authorship of the foregoing extract from a Kingston newspaper, which you were pleased to interpret to your auditors as revealing "a great danger to the State," "one of the dangers of modern civilization," "one of the greatest evils we have to contend with in Parliamentary government," and "against which both parties should cry unite, unite against a common enemy?"

I have the honor to be, dear Sir,
Yours very respectfully,
JAMES VINCENT CLEARY,
Archbishop of Kingston.

Mr. Meredith to Archbishop Cleary.

TO THE EDITOR—I beg to enclose a copy of my reply to the open letter to me from the Archbishop-elect of Kingston, which appeared in your issue of to-day. I should be glad if you would give my reply the same publicity which the letter received.

W. R. MEREDITH.

Toronto, Dec. 19.
MY LORD ARCHBISHOP—I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of yesterday containing a quotation from the Empire's report of my recent address to my constituents at London, and requesting me to inform you and your fellow-citizens of Ontario by what authority I "publicly attribute to you the authorship of the extract from a Kingston newspaper," which I read to my audience.

Taking the report as it stands, I do not think it open to the construction you seem to place on it, or fairly read to do more than indicate the speaker's opinion that the newspaper in question from its position and surroundings might not unreasonably be taken to express your sentiments upon the matter in hand, and that certainly was the full extent to which I intended to go and, as I believe, my words warrant. A public man cannot safely, as you know, be held responsible for the verbal accuracy of every line of an extended report of his utterances, however correct, in the main, that report may be.

Limited as I have pointed out the inference was not, I thought, an unfair one. The newspaper in question is by many understood to be in your confidence at least, and one would hardly have thought that so important a statement would have appeared in it without your approval, or if it had appeared without that approval would have been permitted to remain before the public without at least some effort on your part to modify, if not to withdraw it.

I am very much gratified to find from your letter to me that you do not approve of the sentiments expressed by the writer of the paragraph in question for that I take to be your view, since the inquiry you make of me would be an idle one, and I am pleased to find and shall have great pleasure, in justice to you, as well as in furtherance of the principles for which I am contending, in publicly stating in my future addresses that I have the weight of your great authority with, and not against, me on the important question which forms the subject of this correspondence.

I have the honor to be,
Your Grace's obedient servant,
W. R. MEREDITH.

The Most Reverend the Archbishop (elect) of Kingston, Ont.

Archbishop Cleary to Mr. Meredith.
St. Michael's Palace,
Toronto, December 22, 1889.

To Mr. W. R. Meredith, Q. C. M. P. P.:
DEAR SIR—I am honored by the receipt of your letter of date 19th inst., and would have replied a day earlier had I not been temporarily disabled by a rheumatic affliction, congenial to this season.

I accept unhesitatingly your assurance that The Empire's report of your speech to your constituents in London is verbally incorrect in making you appear to say, with reference to an extract from a Kingston newspaper, which you most severely censured:—"The words are used by a newspaper, but to some extent, I apprehend, by the gentleman who presides over the Archdiocesan See of Kingston."

I likewise take your word implicitly that you meant merely "to indicate your opinion that the newspaper in question, from its position and surroundings, might not unreasonably be taken to express the Archbishop's sentiments upon the matter in hand," which means, I take it, that you hazarded a conjecture and no more.

Too frequently have the political agitators who are engaged in the present anti-Catholic crusade in Ontario given public utterance to that illogical and unjust, and, pardon me if I venture, in addressing you to add, illegitimate conjecture for the sake of creating odium against the hierarchy. The Montreal Witness and The Ottawa Evening Journal have recently committed this offence with a view to bringing me, if they could, into direct antagonism with the newly-founded University of Ottawa, its faculty and its patrons. I have not condescended to notice the insolence of those two journals, whose character is so well appreciated by my clerical and lay friends in Ottawa that contradiction of their injurious statements on Catholic subjects, more particularly on episcopal affairs, is deemed unnecessary. But when the same conjecture is delivered in solemn assembly by you, Sir, whose reputation for personal integrity and high legal ability is undisputed, and whose masculine uprightness of heart, as your friends love to relate, used to find expression even in these noble words, "I would rather give up political life altogether than join in an agitation against my Catholic fellow-citizens," I feel bound to signify my respect for your sentiments, even when you err, and by correcting your mistake to prevent its repetition.

Now, therefore, that the Kingston newspaper referred to by you has no more warrant than any other paper to express my sentiments, it was established independently of me, and is conducted without control on my part, as its editorial pages rather frequently proclaim. I have no pecuniary interest in it; I don't know who its editor is; I have not seen a half dozen copies of it within the last six months. I know nothing of the editorial article stigmatized by you, except that a telegram received from Kingston yesterday in reply to my query to the editor informed me that it appeared on the 25th of last September. Whence you may judge of the forensic value of your most weighty proof of my responsibility, drawn from the fact that the extracted sentence "has been permitted to remain before the public without, at least, some effort on the Archbishop's part to modify it not to withdraw it."

Permit me to supply you with a rule for general guidance in matters of this kind. Whenever you see a letter from the Archbishop or Bishop at the head of a newspaper, especially if the discourse is belittled, approving or recommending it to his flock as the organ of Catholicism in his diocese, or as a reliable exponent of Catholic thought and defender of Catholic rights, then, and then only, are you justified in holding him responsible for its teachings. On the other hand, were I or any other prelate to exercise a rigid censorship over the press, such as you demand, on political topics, or on any other than those directly bearing on faith and morals, although you would, as your letter intimates, applaud our action, many amongst your modern associates would, I am convinced, ring out their loudest denunciations against the Catholic Church, and proceed to vilify her from day to day, and from week to week, as the very type of despotism, the enemy of "free thought" and "modern civilization," the citadel of "obscurantism," and all else that would tend to depreciate her before men.

It now concerns me whether you have rightly or wrongly interpreted the naked sentence you have produced from the Kingston newspaper. You know, as well as I, that a sentence withdrawn from its antecedent and subsequent context may be pleasantly presented to the public in a sense wholly foreign to the mind of the writer. Perhaps you have heard of the unbelieving preacher who boasted of having read in the Bible that "there is no God," and truly he was able to point to the assertion in Psalm xiii. But he had omitted to quote the preceding clause of the verse, which runs thus:—"The fool hath said in his heart, there is no God." Wherefore, since I have no knowledge of the context preceding or following the short sentence you extracted from the Kingston paper, I am unable to form a prudent judgment as to its meaning. Neither does it appertain to my business in any way whatever. The conductors of the news paper are, I presume, able and willing to give you due satisfaction.

I may say to you, however, that I believe you have harmed yourself and your cause by the extravagance that pervades the whole course of your London speech, its looseness of assertion, its inconsequence of conclusions, its unrestrained license of denunciation. Yours was not a casual or extemporaneous address; it was, as it was expected to be, a manifesto of the policy of the political party who own your leadership in the House of Legislature and out of it. And yet you allowed party and passion to overmaster your legal mind to such a degree that because, forthwith, some unknown person wrote a sentence in a Kingston paper exhorting the Catholic population of Ontario to defend themselves against the ferocious bigots of the "Equal Rights Association" by a judicious

exercise of the suffrage in withholding their support from any political party that will not guarantee them security in their natural and Christian and constitutional liberties, you dash off with the triumphant interrogation, "Is there not GREAT DANGER to the STATE in this solemn compact of the minority?" You assume as a fact that method which the unknown writer exhorts to, and, by exhorting, confesses to have no existence. You pronounce it "a danger to modern civilization," and "one of the greatest evils we have to contend with in Parliamentary government," and against which "both parties should cry 'Unite, unite against a common enemy for there is danger in the community.'" This is truly shocking; it is an outrage to Him whose advent to earth you believe to have been heralded by the angelic song, "Peace on earth, good-will to men."

Did the Hon. Mr. Mercer, or the leader of the Opposition in the Quebec Legislature, attempt by any disgraceful method of the kind to catch the votes of the unthinking populace, and influence religious passion against the Protestant minority of Lower Canada, you might have been tempted to charge his crime against his Church as a relic of mediævalism and a specimen of the unlimited morality of that historical period, which the more ignorant of your egoistic friends are wont to facetiously style the "Dark Ages." David, the royal saint, felt no remorse of conscience over the murder of the brave and faithful officer whose bed he had defiled, till the prophet of God appealed to the unextinguished spark of natural justice in his breast by a parable of infinitely less grievous injury done to one of his peasant subjects. Let Lower Canada be your parable.

Alas! it was unworthy of you who expect to hold, some day or other, the office of Premier in the Ministry of this Province, or, this falling year, to mount the Banch of justice for the contentious settlement of claims and disputes between man and man, that you should foment discord and hate amongst Her Majesty's subjects and bid the majority vote in solid compact for the oppression of the minority, whom you have sought to brand with the mark of Cain. Herein you become guilty of all that wickedness imputed by yourself to the unknown author of the Kingston sentence, and you are involved in all your terrible anathemas pronounced against him. He is unknown; his sentence will pass into speedy oblivion despite the factitious importance you have striven to attach to it. Your name and your cruel utterance against your Catholic fellow-citizens, than whom there are no better in the land, will be blazed together in the mind of the next generation, and may their recurrences to us may prompt the prayer, "May God forgive William Meredith."

I remain, dear Sir,
Yours very respectfully,
JAMES VINCENT CLEARY,
Archbishop (elect) of Kingston.

THE REVISION QUESTION.

An amusing incident occurred at the recent session of Pittsburg, Pa., Presbytery, while the discussion was going on concerning the revision of the Westminster Confession of Faith. The debate was very lively and considerable acrimony was displayed, but the decision was against revision, whereupon one of the Revisionists proposed a resolution "that the ministers of the Presbytery be required as soon as possible to present to their several congregations our belief as set forth in the Westminster Confession of Faith upon the following, among other topics: That God has from all eternity ordained some of His creatures to damnation; that elect infants alone are saved, and that the Pope of Rome is anti-Christ." In view of the now acknowledged fact that there is scarcely a single minister or layman who believes these doctrines, the proposal, though quite in accordance with the vote previously given, gave great offence to the anti-revisionists, who, to be consistent, ought to have supported it. It was, however, finally "laid on the table," a direct vote on the question being thus eluded.

The whole question of Revision is being vigorously discussed in all the Presbyteries, and the decision reached by the Presbyteries of New York and New Jersey, which is in favor of the movement of the Revisionists, is generally approved of. Many leading ministers are outspoken in their declarations that "unconditional election and reprobation," as taught in the Confession, are unscriptural doctrines, and these are supported by the largest part of the Presbyterian press; yet there are many who proclaim their unswerving belief in Calvinism pure and simple. Among those in Canada who take this side is the Rev. Mr. McMullen, of Woodstock, the Canadian ex-Moderator, who has been recently writing in the papers in favor of unadulterated Calvinism. Dr. Patton, president of Princeton Presbyterian College, in a paper recently published from his pen, acknowledges that "the Confession could be improved." He adds: "Some of the space now given to the Pope might very well be devoted to that modern compound of Hegel and Schleiermacher known as the doctrine of the Christian consciousness." He would also not grudgingly object if the section on Purgatory were amended so as to condemn what he facetiously calls "the neo-Romanism," which has become a pet doctrine of many Protestants of the present day, that there is a second probation for souls after death, so that those who die at enmity with God may have another opportunity of salvation by their future good conduct in another life. We may remark parenthetically that it is a

man's name to call this "neo-Romanism" or to connect it with the Catholic Church in any way.

This doctrine is a purely Protestant invention, and is primarily a consequence of the Presbyterian teaching on foreordination. It was the thought of the Universalists who could not endure the Presbyterian or Calvinistic doctrine, and who adopted this theory as a mode of vindicating God's justice with which Presbyterianism could not be reconciled.

Rev. Mr. Patton, however, does not think that these considerations justify the movement in favor of Revision. He says:

"A revision of the Confession is not desirable to serve even these important ends. When we consider the danger of unsettling opinion, of disturbing old anchorages, and of being obliged, when the work begins, of going further than was intended, it is better to set upon the maxim, *Quædam non moveo* (Not to disturb what is tranquil)."

He maintains that a new Confession will not have the "veneration that is accorded a symbol that tells the story of our civil and religious liberty," and which has "two hundred years of history in it."

An outsider would suppose it more important to have the Confession true than to have it two centuries old. As two centuries do not make it old enough to be Christ's teaching to His Apostles they count as little as would be two days in justifying the Presbyterian scheme. The Revision movement, however, ignoring, on Mr. Patton's opposition to it will be scarcely of sufficient strength to stem the turbid torrent.

Some of the divines who are favorable to revision go so far as to say that even those who oppose it do not believe the extreme doctrines of the Confession. Dr. McCosh asserted this in the Philadelphia Presbytery, and a clergyman on the other side, Rev. Mr. Greene, said: "Our brother has unintentionally done some of us an injustice in saying we do not believe the doctrine of reprobation. Some of us do believe it with all our hearts; and some of us, on the right occasion, teach it." The limitations expressed in the words "some of us" and "on the right occasion," show the limited extent to which the doctrine is believed and taught, even by those who most resolutely oppose revision. Not long since the Chicago Interior advised newly-ordained ministers to throw aside these doctrines, as they would pick chicken bones, after having solemnly accepted them in their ordination vow as their firm belief. The New York Evangelist and the Interior of Chicago earnestly support the movement for revision, whereas the New York Observer opposes it. In Canada the movement in this direction does not seem to be very strong, though we believe that disbelief in the objectionable doctrines is about as widespread as in the United States. There are, however, some old-fashioned Calvinists who, like Dr. McMullen, adhere to the five points of Geneva John.

Dr. McCosh is quoted in a recent issue of the Springfield Republican as giving utterance to the view that the movement towards revision will bring about "a Presbyterian union," and not only this, but that the Presbyterian Churches will, as he hopes, "look with more favor on other evangelical Churches, such as the Episcopalians, Reformed, Methodist, and Baptist." He considers that if absolute union be not the result, at least the matter "may end in a federation like that of the United States." He imagines that it is only through such a federation that the command can be obeyed, "Preach the Gospel to every creature."

All this is, of course, the natural consequence of the implied theory of the Revisionists, that the Church of Christ should change her doctrines from time to time, to suit the fancies of succeeding generations; but it seems to us that under such a regime, with the jarring doctrines of the sects named, all of which are claimed to be divinely revealed, made up into one loosely compounded nostrum, the reading of the Apostle St. Paul (1 Tim. iii, 15), will need to be revised also. Instead of "the Church of the living God, the pillar and the ground of the truth," we shall have to endure some such text as this: "the Federation of human vagaries and errors;" and instead of the passage which Dr. McCosh quotes: "Preach the Gospel to every creature," we shall have the command, "Preach the Federal fancies wherever another Federalist is not in the field before you."

HONORS TO A TEACHER—We have much pleasure in reproducing the following item from an Ottawa paper: Last evening the St. Patrick's Literary Association tendered a banquet to Mr. T. J. Collins, late Principal of St. Joseph's Separate School, on the eve of his departure for London, Ontario. The president of the association proposed his health, which was drunk with enthusiasm. Mr. Collins responded in a very neat and feeling speech. Many prominent citizens were present, and many able speeches, testifying to the high esteem in which the guest of the evening is held, were delivered by the gentlemen present. Several appropriate songs brought the very pleasant evening to a close. Mr. Collins was bid a hearty God-speed, with sincere wishes for his future success. The repast was served in the Balmoral's best style, and the proprietor received the congratulations of the leading members of the association.