



PAPAL INFALLIBILITY.

Some Protestant Objections Answered.

(London Universe, March 9)

At St. Peter and Paul's, Rosoman Street, London, England, on Sunday evening the Rev. W. Sullivan, D.D., delivered the last of his course of sermons on the "Infallibility of the Pope," the church being crowded, as it had been each of the series. Taking for his text the opening of the Gospel, "This is a hard saying, who can hear it?" And Jesus, knowing that His disciples murmured, said, "Doth this scandalize you?" the rev. preacher accepted the text as being applicable to the Protestants as well as to the Catholics.

SHOULD PROTESTANTS BE SCANDALIZED AT THIS DOCTRINE?

Did not believe in doctrines far more incredible, if reason were to be the final and only judge in these matters? Did they not believe, for instance, in the Sacrament of Baptism, and which was the greater justification of reason—to believe that a few drops of water poured upon the head of a child made it heir to life eternal or to believe that God protected the Head of His Church from teaching erroneous doctrines when he told the faithful how inconsistent it was with what was error. Again, how inconsistent it was of Protestants to cavil at this doctrine of Papal Infallibility, when they themselves proclaimed the Bible to be infallible. In other words, they declared that the men who wrote the Old and New Testament were not only infallible, but that God put into their minds the thoughts which they wrote down. Our Lord declared of John the Baptist: "Greater man born of woman there has not been," and yet the least member of the Church of Christ is greater than John the Baptist. If John the Baptist was infallible, and if the least member of the Christian Church is greater than John the Baptist, how is it a justification of reason to believe that he who is first in that Church is prevented from error when he teaches the flock of Christ committed to his care? It was, however, nothing wonderful that the doctrine of PAPAL INFALLIBILITY WAS ASSAILED.

and misrepresented. There was not a single dogma of the Christian faith which had not been attacked at one time or another, and at the present day had they not Atheists who denied the existence of God and Stoicisms and Unitarians who denied the divinity of Christ? Had they not men who denied that Baptism gave to a child the right to eternal life? Had they not men who denied there was any such place as hell, or who, admitting its existence, asserted that if you got there it would not hurt you very much? No, as he had said, from the existence of God downwards there was not a dogma of the Christian faith that had not been denied. Catholics held that if you give up the Catholic Church you had no logical alternative but to give up the existence of God. There was no logical standpoint between Catholicity and atheism. Even theism had its mysteries, and refused to believe in the doctrines of the Catholic Church because they involved mysteries incomprehensible to unaided reason; and at the same time, to plunge into the mysteries of theism, to plunge into inconsistent and self-contradictory. The first objection urged by Protestants against Papal Infallibility was that it was a new doctrine—that it was not heard of before 1870. Protestants failed to see that the Church only defined a doctrine when that doctrine had been called in question, and that if it had not been denied it would probably never be defined at all. The doctrine of the divinity of Christ was not defined until the year 325—something like 200 years after His ascension into heaven. The Divine maternity of Mary was not defined until the year 380. The eternity of hell was not defined until the sixth century. A new doctrine! And yet they had St. Bede inculcating the absolute necessity of belonging to the community of Peter. They had St. Thomas of Canterbury telling them that only infidels, heretics, and schismatics separated themselves from the See of Rome. They had St. Bernard writing to the Pope, asking him to correct any errors in his book—"because I think

THE WOUNDS OF FAITH

should receive their healing in that Church whose faith can never fall." They had St. Augustine declaring that they only had the Catholic faith who had the Roman faith. They had St. Cyprian proclaiming that "he cannot have God for his father who has not the Church for his mother." A new doctrine! And yet every Father of the Church had inculcated the necessity of being in communion with Rome under the penalty of not belonging to the Church at all. The objection was a proper one, and could only be advanced by those who were ignorant, or who were in bad faith.

AND THE PROTESTANT OBJECTION

urged against the doctrine of Papal Infallibility was that some of the Popes were bad men. It would not matter so far as this dogma went. The fact would leave the question untouched. Whether the Pope be a holy man or not matters to himself. He stands and falls to his Master like the least member of the Church. His personal sanctity had to do with himself as a private individual; his infallibility had to do with the whole Church of Christ. His infallibility was given, not as a personal gift, it was given for the sake of all the members of the Church of Christ, that they might know what to believe and what not to believe. Judas was a bad man, yet he was an Apostle. The Scribes and Pharisees were wicked men, yet our Lord said, "Whatever they say, do ye." Why? Because they were seated in authority. And whether the Pope were holy or not, mattered only to himself; the question touched his private life, not his

official capacity. Considering what human nature was, and taking all the other circumstances into consideration, he declared that it was simply miraculous that out of

THE LONG LINE OF 259 POPES

so few could be pointed out as having led unworthy lives. But if all the bad Popes were multiplied by ten it would not affect in the slightest degree the question of Papal Infallibility. Peter was head of the Church constituted by God—the one Church built upon a rock. The successors of Peter have ruled the Church, and to be in communion with them was, as the father, declared, to be in communion with Christ. What did it matter if one or two out of those 259 Popes were unimpaired of their exalted station? It was his impression that there had been one or two

BAD PARSONS,

yet did any Protestant hold that the efficacy of the Sacrament of Baptism was invalidated because the person who administered had been drunk the day before? Infallibility belongs to the Pope as spiritual head of the Church. He might be a sinner, but the Holy Ghost would still preserve him from error in teaching, lest that by false teaching the faithful should be led to err. Another objection which was frequently levelled against the dogma of Papal Infallibility was that it had never been accepted by the Eastern Church. "It is all very well," they are told, "for the Westerns to talk about Papal Infallibility, but it was never accepted by the patriarchs of Alexandria, of Jerusalem, or of the Seas of Asia Minor." The rev. preacher pointed out that the objection had much in common with the plea with which he had already dealt, that the dogma of Papal Infallibility was a modern one. As a proof that it was equally unfounded, he quoted from the formula signed by 2500 of the Oriental Church, which in his mind, distinctly laid down the dogma of Papal Infallibility. That formula declared that "in the see of Rome the faith of Christ has always been preserved immaculate." It such a formula were to-day presented by a Papal Envoy to

THE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

would he sign it? Certainly not. And yet they were told that the Eastern Church knew nothing about Papal Infallibility! St. Irenaeus was a disciple of Polycarp, who was a disciple of Ignatius, who was a disciple of St. John, confounded any one who denied any doctrine of the Catholic faith by referring them to Rome, declaring that with the Church of Rome, "on account of her greater supremacy, it is necessary that every Church, that is, the faithful wherever dispersed, should be in communion," in which Church had always been preserved "that tradition which is from the Apostles." Would Irenaeus have referred the heretics of his day to Rome if it was possible that it could err? Why did he not send them as modern Protestants would, to search the Scriptures? He knew nothing of that method. He simply said, "You must be in error, because your doctrine does not agree with that of Rome." Again, there was Theodore, the student who wrote that there was only one Church. Was that the Church of Christ or not? He calls the Roman See "the See of the Corymbus"—the see of the Master of All; and the keys of the Christ has deposited the keys of the faith, and from which we all receive the certainty of the faith." Would this Eastern writer have written this if he believed that the Roman Church could err? Sergius, the Metropolitan of Cyprus, addressed the Pope in these words: "O Holy Head, Christ God has destined thy Apostolic See to be the immovable foundation and the pillar of faith; for thou art, as the Divine Word truly says, Peter." Having quoted other Eastern writers and patriarchs in support of the contention that the Eastern Church was in accord with the Western in acknowledging the primacy and the infallibility of the successor of St. Peter, in inculcating obedience to it, the rev. preacher asked if it was possible to conceive that they would have written in this way if they believed that

THE CHURCH OF ROME

could err. Would these Eastern fathers have pointed to a Church out of their own Church and said, "There is the Church you must follow"? If they did not believe that the occupant of the See of Peter was infallible? Having alluded to the inconsistency and self-contradictoriness of Protestant writers—Archbishop Usher for example—in admitting that the Church of Rome was at one time pure and orthodox in denying to her the possession of these prerogatives any longer, while at the same time they were obliged to confess their inability to point out the particular period when she forfeited them, the rev. preacher insisted that individual Protestants were now suffering for the sins of the men who brought about the so-called Reformation. But though Catholics did not blame them, the truth had to be spoken, and the solemn truth was, that as God is God and Christ is our Redeemer, the Roman Church is that Church which Christ founded, and with which it is necessary that all men should be in communion. Addressing the Protestants present, he exhorted them to let nothing stand in the way of their learning the whole truth as it is in Christ. Some of

THE BEST AND NOBLEST

members of the Protestant communion had given up positions of honor and emolument to become humble members of the Catholic Church. They would not have done this if there was not at least a great deal to be said for the Catholic Church.

PAPAL SUPREMACY.

AN IMPORTANT CLAUSE WHICH APPEARS IN THE TREATY OF PARIS OF 1764.

Mr. Anyot, M.P., apropos of the Jesuit Estate Act, in a local paper discusses the question "Is the Pope an alien in Canada in a question affecting Catholic matters?" He says:

The Treaty of Paris of the 10th of February, 1763, contains the following clause: "For her part His British Majesty agrees to grant to the inhabitants of Canada the liberty of the Catholic religion, consequently she

will give most precise and effective orders so that her new Roman Catholic subject may progress and practice their religion according to the rites of the Roman Church in so far as the laws of Great Britain permit." The essence of the organization of the Roman Catholic Church is to have but one head, which is the Pope. Who can say that the treaty being still in force, the Pope exercises a foreign jurisdiction in Canada in so far as Roman Catholic interests are concerned? The Pope occupies in Canada the same position in 1889 that he occupied in 1763. He then appointed and still appoints bishops in Canada, etc. Without his supremacy the Catholic Church could not then, and cannot now, exist in Canada nor anywhere else. It appears by the terms of the treaty that the words "Roman" and "Catholic" were then considered synonymous, and they still are so the whole of the Globe's augmentation falls to the ground.

THE SOVEREIGN PONTIFF.

To the Sacred College.

The Holy Father at the audience on Saturday, the 2nd inst., addressing the members of the Sacred College of Cardinals, said: We could not fail to be sensibly touched by the devotion and affection that mark the words which you, my Lord Cardinals, address to Us in the name of the Sacred College, and by the good wishes that you offer for Our preservation and prosperity. We are consoled and strengthened in seeing the Sacred College taking a most sincere part in Our joys and sorrows, joys and sorrows which always alternate in life, but which this last year have displayed themselves in more striking contrast. We are infinitely indebted to the Lord for the special assistance He has granted Us, not only during this year, but also during all the eleven years of Our Pontificate which have now elapsed; and in commemorating the eighth year of Our life We feel more than ever the necessity of Our humble strength being powerfully sustained by grace from on high. We feel this all the more because the difficulties of the government of the Church in such critical times requires on his part who bears its weight numerous and most serious cares at all moments.

The general condition of Europe and the world, as the Sacred College knows well, is as uncertain and full of danger as possible, and its effect is sadly felt by the Holy See. Deprived of a real sovereignty to ensure its independence, and subject to another power, it cannot but feel the uncertainties, the perils, and the evils to which Italy is exposed internally and externally. Every agitation, therefore, which arises at home, and particularly Rome, every disaster threatening from abroad excites amongst the Catholics fears, anxieties, and an alarm with regard to the destiny of their head. To what may be called the fundamental cause of Our anxiety are added others likewise most serious in consequence of the lamentable state of religious affairs in Italy. It is said, and it has even been repeated in high places, that the Church enjoys the greatest liberty in Italy, and is in a most enviable position. How can such enormities be listened to without a righteous sense of indignation? The very fact of having deposited the Holy See by the occupation of the civil principality of its sovereign independence constitutes of itself an offence which comprehends and embraces all others. The offence is a direct blow at the supreme head of the Catholic Church and at her freedom of action in the world, for when once this freedom is violated or obstructed in any manner whatever, the entire government of the Church necessarily suffers.

But, besides that, We have to deplore other offences against Our spiritual power in Italy. Here the exercise of the episcopal ministry on the part of the pastors whom We name, suffers from delays and obstacles, owing to the requirement with regard to the so-called equator which is always systematically withheld for several months, and which becomes in the hands of the lay authority the means of subjecting persons chosen by Us with the most earnest consideration to fiscal inquiries, often of the lowest kind. More than once, also, We have seen the possession of the masses denied to persons who were most worthy, and who were judged by Us most suitable for the special demands of the dioceses for which they were selected. This, besides depriving them of the necessary means of subsistence, involves sad consequences with respect to many acts of the episcopal jurisdiction, which is indispensable to the government of a diocese. But more remains to be told, for in the case of some nominations the greatest impediments are placed in the way under the pretext of the right of patronage, formerly abandoned, and not exercised for several years, but then resumed and stoutly maintained. The effect of the exercise of these rights, which We can now admit because they are not supported by any judicial foundation or by the conditions desired for their exercise by the sacred canon, would be to leave a considerable number of dioceses indefinitely without pastors. As a matter of fact there are several that have remained vacant for some years and that are extremely desirous of having in their midst Bishops whom we have long since named.

But this is not all. Let Us remind you, simply by mentioning some of the difficulties experienced in recruiting the ranks of the young clergy, and in the matter of ecclesiastical vocation and of the reduction of the number of evangelic workers owing to the dispersion of the religious orders; of the extinction of their influence from the public schools; of the measures against the clergy contained in the Penal Code; of the confiscation of great part of the ecclesiastical property; of the steps already taken and those about to be taken to the detriment of pious works, pious associations, and every Catholic institution; and of the favour bestowed on the secret, the sworn enemies of Christianity. Are these, then, proofs of unlimited freedom now enjoyed by the Church in Italy? No! If this state of affairs is harmful to the Church, it is also most injurious to Italy, and

it exposes the country to all the evils which forgetfulness and contempt of religion bring upon nations. On a previous occasion we explained how important it is for nations not to abandon Christ and His Church, for without the Church's superhuman power they would hope in vain to get the people to discharge their duties and to assure to them the inestimable blessings of peace. This applies in a special manner to Italy, which, having become, thanks to Rome, the centre of the Divine religion, and being favoured by Providence more than any other nation, would experience all the more seriously the consequences of its abandonment of Christ in that its ingratitude would be greater. Nations, like individuals, when they depart from the way that Providence has marked out for them, of a certainty fall miserably into decadence and ruin. It is folly to hope that Italy can have peace, security, and tranquillity as long as the struggle is continued against the Papacy, as long as its rights are trampled under foot, and as long as it is denied that condition of true sovereignty which is the effective safeguard of its independence. May the Italian people see and recognize where and who are their true friends, and in accordance with the promptings of their profoundly religious and Christian character, may they always be inspired by the glorious traditions of their best days.

Amidst the difficulties which surround us We confide in the aid of Heaven and in the agency of the ones whom We uphold, and assured of the constant co-operation of the Sacred College, we shall pursue our work with courage, awaiting and hastening by prayer the moment of mercy for the Church and society. In conclusion, expressing once more to the Sacred College the gratitude of Our heart, We grant as a pledge of our special affection to all its members, and to the Bishops, Prelates, and all present the Apostolic Benediction.

HIS HOLINESS LEO XIII.

To the Bishops of Quebec Province.

The following communication has been received by Cardinal Taschereau and the bishops, in reply to addresses for the restoration of the Pope's Temporal power:—"The Apostolic salutation and blessing be unto you. We have received a letter filled with affection and respect for us as well as with zeal and pastoral solicitude in connection with the general relations of the Dioceses of Quebec, Montreal and Ottawa, you have addressed to us. It is extremely proper, in virtue of the sanctity and the grandeur of your office, to vindicate the liberty and the rights of the Apostolic chair, and to demand an account for the malice of those men who only seek to lessen the dignity of the Sovereign Pontiff, to cover the Catholic religion with scorn, and to turn away its servants from their duty by the fear of penalties. Your letter caused us the more pleasure because it displays an admirable unity of sentiment and evenness of language and expression with those which we have received on the same subject from the bishops of several other countries. This unanimous agreement affords us no small consolation. It shows us that Divine Power which involves into one body all the parts of the flesh of our Lord, nothing being more secure and more calculated to conquer the audacity and the designs of the enemies of the Church, who desire above all things to create dissensions among the faithful. We hope also that the divine union displayed amongst so many men of great wisdom and great authority, will be able to influence the minds of a good number of those who have fled to the camp of the enemy, or who adhere to it by carelessness or wilful ignorance. And let not man neglect to bear your advice and your demands to which we attach very great importance, and to the universal zeal, which is very pleasing to us, which causes us to pray, in union with your brethren in the Episcopate, that God the Sovereign Ruler of all things, might render powerless the thoughts of the unbelieving, and that He might bring their prospects to naught, and that He might spread abroad among His people the fruits of peace possessing our souls in patience and in the firm hope that Divine aid will never be wanting to the Church. We add with your ever deepest thanks for the devotion with your care, and we call down upon you the heavenly gifts of heaven, which will make you powerful in accomplishment of all good. In token of this gratefulness, and as a proof of the value we place on your regard, we bestow upon you our dear son, in the name of the Lord, the Apostolic Benediction, upon the other archbishops and bishops who are joined with you in the letter which we have received, as well as upon the clergy and the faithful who are confined to your care. "LEO XIII."

FATHER HAND'S THIRD SERMON

(Toronto Empire, 25th March.)

Father Hand, preaching at St. Michael's cathedral last evening, again dealt with the Jesuit question, discussing various charges made against the order, such as justification of means by the end, mental reservations, etc. That would be the last time he would treat the subject, and he could not conclude without calling attention to a charge made against the priests of Toronto, on Saturday, in the editorial page of a city newspaper. He quoted Mr. Peter Ryan's letter to the Globe and the editorial remarks thereon, as the expression of the well-known and all-quoted Roman Catholic Liberal, Mr. Peter Ryan. The opinions that he expresses are, we are happy to know, shared by many of his co-religionists, including several of their clergy." He said had this paper confined itself to dealing with the correspondent "and his co-religionists," he would not have had anything to say upon the matter from the public, but a grave charge had been made against the loyalty of the Catholic clergy of the Arch-diocese of Toronto to the Holy See. Catholic laymen were quite capable of speaking for themselves about these newspaper charges, and they had abundant proof of the trend of opinion from the weekly press of the province, without depending on the special dictum of any local correspondent. He (Peter Ryan) had many facilities for knowing the views of the clergy upon this particular question. Within the last two weeks the priest of the Deanery of Toronto had a conference, and, in an informal manner, he found that they were a unit in approving of the ratification by the Holy See of the settlement of the Quebec question. They

entirely agreed that the Holy Father was not a foreigner in any other country. He is elected by the College of Cardinals, and in that college Canada, the United States and England are represented. The Pope is elected not as the representative of any State in Italy, but to rule as the doctor and teacher of the universal Church. So far as the allegiance of the Catholics of Toronto to the Pope was called into question, they would not allow themselves to be placed in the same category with Henry VIII., who refused to recognize the supremacy of the Pope; they would prefer to be classed with Fisher and Moore.

RICHARD PIGOTT'S DIARY.

IT IS IN THE HANDS OF MR. PARNELL'S SOLICITORS.

Great Dislay in the Tory Camp—It Contains a Complete Record of All the Dead Former's Negotiations With the "Times" and the Government—How Michael Davitt Got Hold of It.

(N. Y. World.)

LONDON, March 23.—All eyes are anxious for a peep at Pigott's diary, especially the men who have been persecuting Parnell. The Times and the Government are using in vain all their powerful resources to obtain even an inkling of the revelations promised from a page. The Irish members were planning to spring a surprise on Attorney-General Webster by means of the diary, and are not a little annoyed with Mr. Timothy Healy, M. P., for letting the cat out of the bag in his speech in the House of Commons. Mr. Healy vows that he did not positively say that the diary was secured, but that the Nationalists hoped to secure it. Mr. Healy himself knows nothing definite about the contents of the diary. With the exception of Mr. Parnell, Sir Charles Russell, Solicitor General Lewis and Mr. Henry Labouchere, it is doubtful if anybody has been permitted to look at it. Mr. George Lewis said to the World correspondent to-day while discussing the subject: "All that I can tell you is that the diary is in the hands of Mr. Parnell's solicitors, and will be safely kept there till produced before the commission. All statements as to its contents are mere guesswork. No one will be allowed even a glimpse of it till it is put in evidence."

A prominent Irish member of Parliament included in the Times indictment, remarked to the World correspondent to-day: "I know for a certainty that the diary will furnish some lively fun. It seems almost as though Pigott had shaped everything that he did with a view to make mischief for the people whom he detested into trusting him. Everything he did, everything he said, everything that was said to him, and doubtless a great many things that was not said to him, he shovelled into this diary. Its chief value to us will be to prove how much the Times depended on the assistance of the Government and the police to make out any case at all."

Scores of stories are told as to how the diary was obtained. But the story which is believed to be the correct version is in one of the letters to Mr. Labouchere's house Pigott could not remember a certain name, but casually mentioned that he could have done so if he had brought his diary with him. The remark did not make much impression on Mr. Labouchere in the excitement of the moment. But sitting next to Mr. Michael Davitt in the House of Commons afterwards it occurred to him again, and he told Mr. Davitt. The first chance that Davitt had to slip off to Kingston, went to Pigott's house and soon got on the track of the diary. It was in the hands of a Dublin man, who declined to give it up without the payment of a large sum of money. Mr. Davitt came back here, raised the great sum, and secured the diary. The energetic personal work of Mr. Michael Davitt will form an important part in it.

HEALY'S STORY ABOUT COL. NEW.

Mr. Tim Healy was dining with some friends in the House of Commons when he visited the Col. New was appointed the United States Consul-General to London, and forthwith proceeded to tell the following story. He said: "When I was speaking in Indianapolis seven years ago, the paper edited by Col. New, made a most unfair attack on me and on our cause. I called at the Journal office and was presented by Col. New. He gave me a chair to speak he exclaimed: "Oh, sir, we know all about you and your crowd." As he spoke he took from his desk a copy of the Fortnightly Review and showed me the article whence he derived his information. That article," added Mr. Healy, "was written by Richard Pigott."

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL LOOKS ILL.

Despite his powerful physique Attorney-General, Sir Richard Webster looks harassed and aged after his week's steps in the House of Commons. Now that the strain is over he is going into the country to rest till he comes before the Commission to face the pages of Pigott's dread diary. In addition to the diary, Solicitor Lewis is believed to have secured several letters which will make a sensation.

DEATH OF A PATRIOT PRIEST.

The comparatively sudden death of Father Corn of Woodford, Ireland, on the 6th inst., has caused intense grief, not only among the people of his parish but to all who have heard of the good priest's martyr-like devotion in the cause of the poor and oppressed.

With a noble courage worthy the Sovereign of Ireland's bravest days, Father Corn flung himself into the battle for the people's rights, directed their course, roused their courage, shared their privations and braved the tyrant's wrath. He bore the flag of his oppressed people against the rack-renting robbers of the O'Riordan estate; and when at last landlord power, backed by Balfour's bayonets and bullets, succeeded in driving the people from their humble homes—flinging them out upon the roadside to perish—his was the great heart that made every sacrifice for their shelter and sustenance.

Father Oen's last public address was a stern defence in behalf of his people of Glenties and his wretched little tyrant minions, who accuse him in this day of their supreme struggle the poor people should lose such wise guides and heroic leaders. It is also a melancholy thought that such generous souls who for long dreary years tread with their people through the agonizing darkness, should be taken from them just as the dawn begins to break.—Catholic Union and Times.

The apple eye longed for and ate at last must have been a pite apple.

JESUITS' ESTATES BILL.

Denounced at a Toronto Meeting—Disallowed Demand—Father Drummond Replies to Hostile Criticisms—The "Mail's" Plan of Campaign.

TORONTO, March 25.—The Protestant demonstration against the Jesuit Estates act at the Pavilion this evening called nearly three thousand people, as many as the Pavilion could hold, and many were turned away. Ex-Mayor Howland presided and Public School Inspector J. L. Hughes acted as secretary. A list of resolutions had been prepared, strongly condemning the act. There were numerous speakers, among them the chairman and secretary, Rev. D. J. Macdonnell, Rev. E. Fréchette, Cavan, Henry O'Brien and J. J. MacLaren, Q.C., who discussed the legal aspect of the case. County Orange Master Ald. Bell, H. A. E. Kent, chairman of the Public School Board, J. H. Macdonald, J. T. Small, Dr. W. W. Ogden, R. V. A. Courciere and Rev. Dr. Sutherland. The following resolutions were presented and unanimously endorsed with the utmost enthusiasm:—

THE JESUITS ARE DENOUNCED.

1. This public meeting of citizens of Toronto expresses its emphatic condemnation of the Jesuit Estates Act passed by Quebec's Legislature in violation, as we believe, of the true principles of civil and religious liberty and equality. We would, at the same time, protest against the recent incorporation of the Jesuits, a measure which we are persuaded is unconstitutional in any British dependency. It is our conviction that the disqualifying of the Jesuit society to hold property by the Imperial Parliament in 1774 after the abolition of that society by the Pope in the previous year and the taking possession of the property by the Crown were not only justifiable, but an imperative duty in the interests of good government and public morality.

THE CLAIM OF THE CROWN.

2. The title of the Crown was reaffirmed by act of the Legislature of Lower Canada, passed in the year 1829 (2 William IV., c. 11), by which this property was accepted, in accordance with Imperial direction "for the purposes of education exclusively," and its application for such purposes was further reaffirmed by act of Parliament of the province of Canada in 1855. We, therefore, protest earnestly against the reversion of these proceeds in breach of the trusts upon which they were accepted by Canada.

THE RECOGNITION OF THE POPE.

3. We further object to this act because it recognizes the right of the Pope to intervene in our national affairs, and because such recognition is in direct contradiction of the Imperial statute and derogatory to the supremacy of the Queen.

THE DOMINION INTEREST.

4. Inasmuch as under Confederation the interests of all the provinces are inseparably connected, we hold it to be the duty of all good citizens, irrespective of creed, to oppose measures which seriously threaten the peace and prosperity of the Dominion, and to use all legitimate means of preventing such legislation from being finally sustained.

DISALLOWANCE DEMANDED.

5. Believing, as we do, on the grounds set forth in the previous resolutions, that a measure of such a character should clearly be disallowed by the Dominion Government, we call upon the representatives of the city in the House of Commons to prove themselves faithful in this crisis to the great principles of civil and religious freedom, and to record their votes in favor of disallowance.

READY FOR FUTURE ACTION.

6. That the co-operation of our fellow-citizens throughout the Dominion be asked in taking such action as may be necessary for the maintaining and enforcing of the principles embodied in the foregoing resolutions and that to that end the following committee be appointed, viz:—W. H. Holland, J. L. Hughes, Rev. Principal Cavan, Rev. D. J. Macdonnell, Rev. A. A. Courciere, J. J. MacLaren, Q.C., S. O. Duncan Clark, Dr. W. Ogden, Dr. S. B. Pollard, J. W. Carter, Ald. Wm. Bell, E. Somers, H. A. E. Kent, Wm. Wilson, W. J. Mo-Mawer, B. Newman, W. Gordon, L. Walker, J. Fréchet, B. A. Sault, John T. Small, Rev. Dr. Sutherland, G. H. Robinson, Henry O'Brien and Wm. Gooderham, with power to add.

FATHER DRUMMOND'S REPLY.

OTTAWA, March 25.—Rev. Father Drummond, S.J., preaching at St. Patrick's church to-night, replied to the pamphlet written by Rev. J. J. Roy, of Winnipeg, against the Jesuit order. The personal attack against himself was also dealt with at great length. He contended that the brief of suppression issued by Clement XIV. was not an infallible decree, only papal bulls carrying these functions. The various houses of the order in Canada were in debt, and they did not possess the fabulous wealth attributed to them by their enemies. For instance, when he went to Montreal 1870 St. Mary's college was in debt to the extent of \$190,000, and although this amount has been reduced from time to time the order is still in debt. It was the same in every Jesuit order where he had taught. Portions of his remarks were of a very humorous character. He tried to show that it was a matter of money which caused the parents of Mr. Roy to abjure Catholicity and embrace the Protestant faith.

THE "MAIL'S" PLAN OF CAMPAIGN.

TORONTO, March 25.—It is understood that the Mail Printing Company is making preparations for its liberal attack with the Jesuits, wholly regardless of expense. The company will send a commissioner at once to France and Belgium for the purpose of arranging with prominent statesmen there to come over and give evidence touching the operations of the Jesuit society in these countries. A distinguished Paris advocate will also be engaged to assist the Mail's commission in Montreal and Toronto in preparing interrogatories to be put at the trial to the heads of the Jesuit order here.

A PROTEST FROM BELLEVILLE.

BELLEVILLE, Ont., March 25.—The Ministerial Association to-day adopted resolutions deploring and condemning the incorporation of the Society of Jesus by the Quebec Legislature.

ANOTHER BIG HOME RULE VICTORY.

A GLADSTONIAN MAJORITY DOUBLED. LONDON, March 25.—The election in the Gorton division of Lancashire, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Richard D. Webb (Gladstonian) resulted in the return of William Mother (Gladstonian), who received 5,125 votes, against 4,809 for Ernest Hatch (Conservative and Liberal Unionist). The Gladstonian majority increased 4,529 votes and the Conservative majority fell 4,122.