

The Northwest Review

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED AT

Room II, Grain Exchange Building.

EVERY WEDNESDAY BY

E. J. DERMODY & CO.

ADVERTISING RATES.

Made known on application. Orders to discontinue advertisements must be sent to the office in writing.

Advertisements unaccompanied by specific instructions inserted until ordered out. Notice of Births, Marriages and Deaths, 50 cents for each insertion.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

All Postage is paid by the Publishers. The Northwest Review \$2 a year, \$1 for six months.

Club Rates.—Six copies of the Northwest Review for \$10. In ordering for clubs, the full number of subscriptions, with the cash must be sent at one time.

The Northwest Review is the official organ for Manitoba and the Northwest of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association.

Correspondence conveying facts of interest will be welcomed and published. Agents wanted to canvass for the Northwest Review in every town in the Northwest. Write for terms.

A Catholic correspondent wanted in every important town. The following gentlemen have been appointed agents of the Northwest Review: Master Andrew G. Crawford, Brandon, Man.

Mr. A. A. McKinnon, Fort William, Ont. and Mr. C. Dahm, Rat Portage, Ont. J. Barreau, Medicine Hat, N. W. T.

Subscribers in arrears will please pay them. They are also authorized to canvass for subscribers, give receipts for all monies collected on account, etc. at one time.

Address all Business Communications to THE NORTHWEST REVIEW. Post office Box 508, Winnipeg, Man.

The Northwest Review

OUR ARCHBISHOP'S LETTER.

ST. BONIFACE, Dec. 12th, 1892. Messrs. E. J. Dermody, & Co.

GENTLEMEN—I see by the last issue of the Northwest Review that you have been instructed by the directors of the journal with the management of the same, "the company for the present retaining charge of the editorial columns."

I need not tell you that I take a deep interest in the Northwest Review which is the only English Catholic paper published within the limits of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories. I hope that you will obtain a remunerative success. It is enough that the editors do their work gratuitously, it cannot be expected that they should be remunerated by the directors of the journal.

I therefore strongly recommend to all Catholics under my jurisdiction to give a liberal support to the Northwest Review. It is fully my approval, though, of course, I cannot be responsible for every word contained in it. The editors write as they think proper, they are at full liberty to say what they wish and in the way they like best.

The sole control I can claim is over the principles they express and I have no hesitation in stating that the principles announced by them are sound and ought to be endorsed by every sound Catholic in this country.

I therefore consider that you enter a good work and I pray to God that He will bless you in its accomplishment. I remain, Yours truly, in Christ, ALEX. ARCHBISHOP OF ST. BONIFACE, O. M. I.

NOTICE.

The editor will always gladly receive (1) ARTICLES on Catholic matters, matters of general or local importance, even political if not of a party character. (2) LETTERS on similar subjects, whether conveying or asking information or controversial. (3) NEWS NOTES, especially such as are of a Catholic character, from every district in North Western Ontario, Manitoba, the Territories and British Columbia. (4) NOTES of the proceedings of every Catholic Society throughout the city or country. Such notes will prove of much benefit to the society themselves by making their work known to the public.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 29.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

When the clique of Ulster malcontent have vanquished the military forces of England they can proceed to the conquest of the other three provinces of Ireland. Not a moment sooner.

The Holy Father would not allow them to make use of him in Germany. He declined to use his influence to secure the passage of the Army bill. Consistent with his action everywhere, he would not interfere with the politics of the German Empire.

It looks as if the Unionists have delegated the task of fighting the demand of the Home Rulers to the Orange brethren of Ulster. Lack of argument against the bill in the House of Commons is being supplemented by bluster in the lodges. Strategy of this kind demonstrates that Balfour and his following are in the last ditch.

Protestant sentiment in Germany against the return of the Jesuits is finding expression in memorials to the Emperor protesting against their re-admittance. The Kaiser will not be influenced by the prayers of these unreasonable bigots. Constitutional government has been carried on, and there is a Catholic controlling the Reichstag. The Jesuits are bound to return.

Catholic parents are in conscience bound to give their children a thorough Catholic education. This can only be obtained in a Catholic school. In places where there is no Catholic school and Catholic children are compelled to attend a public school, parents are obliged to instruct their children in the tenets of the Faith. This rule is inexorable.

It does not need the assurance of the Duke of Devonshire to convince us in our belief that the House of Lords will throw out the Home Rule bill. It is the destiny of their Lordships to do so, and they cannot go back on it. The time has come for relieving those hereditary legislators of their functions, and all that is needed to precipitate the matter is a sharp and decided issue between them and the elected representatives of the people. "Throwing out" the Home Rule bill will furnish the necessary casus belli, and Gladstone and his party will retaliate by throwing out the Lords.

THE POPE ENDORSES NATIONAL SCHOOLS.

Perhaps among all the misrepresentations on the school question in Manitoba none are so amusing as those put out by the gigantic, though somewhat heavy intellect, of the Brandon Sun. Under the above heading, the Sun builds up a man of straw for the amusing privilege of knocking it down. Of course "the Pope endorses national schools." So does every Catholic in Manitoba endorse them. What they do not endorse are Protestant schools for the education of Catholic children. That is something that they do not and never will endorse.

Evidently the ponderous intellect which guides the destinies of the Sun has not yet grasped the difference between a national and a Protestant school system. Of course, the Pope is very anxious to endorse a national system of schools properly conducted, but it would require a great stretch of imagination to make the Pope believe that a school, in which Protestantism is inculcated and taught and Catholicism insulted, is a national school worthy of endorsement. But, then, the Sun says that "the Pope endorses national schools" and, of course, the Sun knows all about it. And now that the Pope does endorse these schools, the Sun says that the Catholics of Manitoba are in a "real difficulty" what to do! It is really very kind of our contemporary to compassionate us on this "real difficulty," but we assure it that the real difficulty with us is to understand how it is that the Sun is such a stupendous jackass. It is a clear loss of time to try to enlighten it. It says:

"It is beyond all doubt that archbishop Ireland and the progressive party in the states have insured the pope's special commendation and endorsement of their views on the discontinuance of separate or parochial schools, so far as they have advised in that direction."

Now, this sheet completely misrepresents Archbishop Ireland when it says that he wishes the "discontinuance of separate schools," or that the Pope was against those schools. On the contrary our Holy Father is most anxious that these parochial schools be maintained wherever it is possible to do so efficiently.

It is only when the Catholics are too poor to support or efficiently maintain parochial schools, that the Pope tolerates the public schools, and then he only does so on the express command that greater precautions be taken to counteract the evil influences which an attendance at such public schools create. Is that endorsing those schools? We may have to tolerate a thing which we cannot endorse. The editor of the Sun is an instance of what we mean. While none but a fool could endorse any of the "rot" he writes about Archbishop Ireland and Satolli and the Pope, yet we are required to tolerate the ignorance of the thing itself. The church is always reasonable and never expects impossibilities. Hence it is that if Catholics are too poor, or too few to support an efficient Catholic school, the church will allow them to use the other school, but in such instances she requires greater care on the part of parents and pastors. Mgr. Satolli very clearly sets this out in his eleventh proposition, of which we have heard so much. In that proposition he says:

"It is greatly to be desired, and will be a most happy arrangement, if the Bishops agree with the civil authorities or with the members of the School Board, to conduct the school with mutual attention to and due consideration of their respective rights."

"While teachers of the secular branches are legally inhibited from offending Catholic religion and morality, let it be the right and duty of the church to teach children the catechism, in order to remove danger to their faith and morals from any quarter whatsoever."

It seems well to quote here the words of our Holy Father, Leo XIII. (See the Pope's letter to the Archbishop of New York and to the Bishops of the Province):

"We further desire you to strive earnestly that the various local authorities, firmly convinced that nothing is more conducive to the welfare of the Commonwealth than religion, should by wise legislation provide that the system of education which is maintained at the public expense, and to which Catholics, therefore, also contribute their share, be in no way prejudicial to their conscience or religion."

Or, we are persuaded that even your fellow citizens who differ from us in belief, with their characteristic intelligence and prudence, will readily set aside all suspicions and all views unfavorable to the Catholic church, and willingly acknowledge her merit, as the one that dispelled the darkness of paganism by the light of the Gospel and created a new society distinguished by the laudable of Christian virtues and by the cultivation of all that refines. We do not think that any one there, after looking into these things clearly, will let Catholic parents be forced to erect schools which they cannot use for the instruction of their children."

Here is found all that the Pope endorses! And in endorsing it, we would like to call the special attention of the Sun to the first and last sentences of the Pope's remarks. Read them over carefully, dear Sun and you will find in them a clear and unequivocal condemnation of the Government of Manitoba in abolishing the very thing the Pope recommends and establishing in its place "schools which they (the Catholics) cannot use for the instruction of their children."

The Catholic Times, speaking of this letter of our Holy Father says: "The letter, so far as we know, has never been published. This is much to be regretted, as we infer from the part quoted by Mgr. Satolli, that the whole letter was the eloquent appeal of a

Pontiff whom the world admires, to the love of fair play, to the generosity and to the religious sentiment that characterizes the great mass of the American people.

The object of it is to direct the attention of our fellow citizens to the hardships Catholics labor under in being obliged to pay taxes for schools they cannot send their children to. The Pope concludes with these hopeful words, founded on his knowledge of the American character:

We do not think that anyone there after looking into these things clearly will let Catholic parents be forced to erect schools which they cannot use for the instruction of their children.

The vital point, however, is expressed in the following words: "We further desire you to strive earnestly that the various local authorities should, by wise legislation, provide that the system of education which is maintained at the public expense, and to which Catholics, therefore, also contribute their share, be in no way prejudicial to their conscience or religion."

These words that have been so severely criticised are not the words of Mgr. Satolli, but the Pope's."

What amount of comfort can the Brandon Sun or the Greenway government extract from the utterances of the Holy Father on this subject.

The ideal school is that in which religion is taught, that in which the moral nature is developed step by step with intellectual and physical nature. Such is the ideal, or perfect type of a Christian school contemplated in the legislation of the Council of Baltimore. This ideal type is what Catholics should strive for when it is possible.

The Holy Father in his decree concerning the Faribault system says: "In truth we have in the examination and judgment of this cause been mindful and extremely careful of the decrees on parochial schools which, by the previous directions of this Apostolic See, were adopted at the synods of Baltimore. Indeed we desire that these decrees be faithfully observed, but, as in the case of all general laws, if any special and unexpected circumstances arise equity suggests that an arrangement departing somewhat from the letter of the law may be tolerated."

This declaration, together with the instructions given to the Archbishops and Bishops of the province of New York and quoted in proposition XI, gives the full mind of the Holy Father on the school question.

Having indicated what the perfect Christian school ought to be in cases where the ideal type can be realized, he directs attention to other cases where, owing to certain conditions and circumstances, this ideal is practically impossible and gives instructions in reference to those children who have only the alternative of growing up in ignorance or attending the public schools. His words are clear and emphatic:

"We further desire that you strive earnestly that the various local authorities should, by wise legislation provide that the system of education which is maintained at the public expense, and to which Catholics, therefore, also contribute their share, be in no way prejudicial to their conscience or religion."

Despite all our trouble in trying to enlighten the Sun on this subject; despite the fact that Mgr. Satolli and the Pope govern the very thing the Greenway government has done and applaud that which it has undone; despite all this, the editor of the Sun will again return to this subject with an ignorance or willfulness truly alarming, and renew again its misrepresentation of Mgr. Satolli and our Holy Father.

THE PRESBYTERIANS AND THE PRIVY COUNCIL.

Ever since the passage of the present school act, no Synod, Conference, or other meeting of the sects has closed its labors without, in some way, placing two things on record (1) denouncing any attempt to remove the Bible or Protestant religious exercises from the class room, and (2) to endorse the action of the Greenway Government in abolishing Catholic schools. It may appear illogical and contradictory, to some minds, to place those two propositions side by side, but yet, such is the fact. These sects see no contradiction whatever in demanding religious exercises and the Bible for themselves, and, at the same time, abolishing, or rather endorsing the abolition of similar rights for Catholics. It was no surprise, then, to the public, that the Presbyterians in Synod assembled, did pass such a set of resolutions, last November. They had done so before and were only repeating the

In fact it would be a surprise if a synod of any of the sects had closed its deliberations without endorsing the Greenway government for what it had done to the Catholics. But what made their resolutions particularly interesting to the public was a startling fact which escaped from Dr. Bryce during the debate on the resolutions under consideration. Had Dr. Bryce been speaking for himself, or had he made the remarks we are about to quote and given them as the result of his own opinions, we would have simply put them down as a further instance of Bryconian floundering, but as he made those remarks in the Synod and with its endorsement, they are deserving of very serious consideration.

Among many other things, Dr. Bryce said, in speaking on the educational question under consideration by the Synod:

"The Synod ought to firmly and decidedly take a stand. The action of the Presbyterian body, as representing the

strongest religious denomination in the Northwest, in declaring for national schools on two previous occasions, which declaration was sent to the Privy Council, had an important effect on the decision which was given."

Now, what think you, friends of the rev. doctor Bryce, about the morality of this admission? What think you of the morality of a body of Christians, in solemn Synod assembled, who could have the audacity to send their narrow and intolerant declarations to the Privy Council, for the purpose of affecting their decision? The Catholic minority were fighting for their dearest rights; those rights were pending before the highest court in the Empire; they were *sub judice*, and a religious sect, which claims to be the strongest in the Northwest, actually and really sent resolutions to their Lordships of the Queen's Privy Council, for the express purpose of effecting their judgment on a matter involving the legal status of the Catholic minority! And Dr. Bryce said that this declaration "had an important effect on the decision which was given!" Had Catholics said this much about the Privy Council; had they hinted that their Lordships were guilty of such a crime against law and justice, and the most ordinary rules of jurisprudence those men would hold up their hands in holy horror and accuse us of everything bad, but, what would have been crime in us was an act of righteousness on the part of the Presbyterian synod? Does that synod realize what its language means? Do they realize the compromising position in which they place the judges of the highest court in the realm? It was bad enough to let the public know that they approached the judges of the Privy Council with copies of their declarations! That was an act of infamy and an insult to the court; but to openly and publicly boast that they successfully did so, is to cast a damning stain on the integrity and impartiality of the Highest court in the Empire. Shame and the fear of an outraged public opinion made the synod keep its infamous conduct a close secret, and had it not been for the moral obliquity of the Rev. Dr. Bryce the general public would never have known anything about it. It would never have known to what depths of infamy and to what insulting impertinence a Presbyterian synod can go to interfere with and, if possible, destroy the rights of Catholics. And yet these are the men who would have us believe that they are actuated by no other feeling towards us than that of justice and fair play?

Now that the Rev. Dr. and through him the Presbyterian synod, have told us that it approached the Privy Council; that in doing so, declarations "had an important effect on the decision which was given;" that at the time the synod did so, the case before the court was *sub judice*, would Dr. Bryce, or the synod for whom he was speaking, go one step further and tell us by what authority he boldly claims that the Privy Council was "affected" in its decision by the representations of the Presbyterian synod? We were of the opinion that their Lordships had only to deal with a question of Law. We would not like to insult their Lordships by asking the synod if the judges of the Privy Council officially notified the synod of the receipt of their declaration and informed it of the "important effect" which said declarations had on the decision which their Lordships gave on the appeal then pending before them? The rev. doctor would confer a favor by enlightening the public on this point. We have always, in these columns, treated that "Tribunal of Last Resort" with great consideration and would not even now, treat it disrespectfully; but the Rev. Dr. Bryce having made that statement in open synod must either substantiate it or withdraw it. It was not contradicted then or since, although it appeared in the press of the city on the 23rd of last November, was Dr. Bryce deliberately lying when he made this statement, or did the Privy Council imitate to him or any member of the Presbyterian synod that it was either directly or indirectly affected in its decision of the Manitoba school case, by the Synod of the Presbyterian church in Manitoba? If they did not, then we leave Dr. Bryce and his Presbyterian friends to the judgment of an indignant and outraged public.

ARE THE SCHOOLS PROTESTANT?

The Hon. Mr. Laurier, in his speech on the school question referring to the statement made by His Grace, the Archbishop of St. Boniface, that the present schools of Manitoba are Protestant, said:

"If this be indeed true, if under the guise of public schools the Protestant Catholic children are being forced to attend these Protestant schools, I say and let my words be heard by friends and foes over the length and breadth of the land, the strongest case has been made out for interference, and, though my life as a political man depended upon it, I would undertake to say on every platform in Ontario and Manitoba, yes, and in every lodge room, that the Roman Catholics of Manitoba had been put to the most infamous treatment."

Mr. Laurier is quite right in his opinion "that the Roman Catholics of Manitoba had been put to the most infamous treatment." At the recent meeting of the Winnipeg Public School Board, a motion was passed that will remove all doubt on that point from the mind of the Hon. gentleman that "under the guise of public schools, the Protestant schools

are continued and Roman Catholic children are forced to attend these Protestant schools" or, at least, support them and provide other schools afterwards for themselves. The motion read as follows:

Moved by Messrs. Howard and Cameron that the religious exercises prescribed by the advisory board be observed in all the public schools of Winnipeg.

In the matter of religious exercises, the superintendent explained what was done in this line, at present. Selections from the authorized edition of Scriptural passages are read and the Lord's prayer or other prayer in the formula is repeated; all this is done at the close of the day's session in order to give all desirous of retiring an opportunity to do so. The ten commandments are repeated and the instructions of the advisory board are carried out. The memorizing of certain pieces of poetry and the ten commandments are suggested as being an excellent means of enforcing morality.

We wish to point out to the Hon. Mr. Laurier and to all others whom it may concern or interest, that "the religious exercises prescribed by the Advisory Board" are exactly the same as those which were formerly prescribed by the Protestant section of the defunct Board of Education—nothing more and nothing less.

During the twenty years educational history of the province, prior to the present school act, there existed a system of schools known as Protestant schools. In those schools the religious exercises were the same as those prescribed by the Advisory Board for use in the present schools. We claim, therefore, that the present public schools are Protestant under the thin guise of public schools. It is true they are called in the act, non-sectarian schools, but they have no more right to be considered such than had the old Protestant schools. If the present schools are non-sectarian, then the old Protestant schools were non-sectarian and again if the old Protestant schools were Protestant, then the present ones are equally so. Mr. Laurier, then, is quite safe in proclaiming it "over the length and breadth of the land" that "the strongest case has been made out for interference" on behalf of a persecuted and most infamously treated minority. We tell the Honorable gentleman that he may search through all the political records of this country and he cannot find anything to equal the treachery, duplicity and dishonesty which mark the conduct of the present government in dealing with the Catholic minority in Manitoba. The French and Catholic minority had it in their power to retain the Harrison government in office and keep Mr. Greenway in opposition. Greenway and Martin knew this, and in order to get into office they made the most solemn promises to the French Catholics that they would protect them in all the rights and privileges which they were then enjoying, and in every way befriended them, provided those French Catholics would support their candidate, who was a Presbyterian and defeat the government candidate, who was a minister and a French Canadian Catholic. But why repeat the vile conduct of the Greenway government. It must be well known to the Hon. leader of the Liberal party at Ottawa, as it is to every who has any knowledge of Manitoba politics. We would also remind Mr. Laurier that the present attorney-general of Manitoba, lately repudiated all those promises, made by Mr. Greenway and Mr. Martin, because they were not written in the platform of the party. Mr. Laurier may not be able to see the nice distinction made by Manitoba's attorney-general, but it may serve to give him a better knowledge of the political morality of the government of the province of Manitoba. But, no doubt, the hardest thing of all for Mr. Laurier to understand will be the gigantic cheek of those men in calling themselves *Liberals!*

ULSTER AND HOME RULE.

Regardless of the fact that Gladstone is a Protestant—indeed, the Protestant who aimed a severe blow at the Catholic church twenty years ago; and also that all the members of his Cabinet, with one exception, are Protestant, the Orange leaders of Ulster pretend to believe, and succeed in making their ignorant followers believe, that the Home Rule bill is designed to give the Catholics of Ireland the opportunity to persecute Protestants. These Orangemen held a meeting at Belfast last week which, it is said, was attended by fifteen thousand people. It was called by the Mayor of that city, and in his capacity of chairman, that official delivered an address which was remarkable, even in Orange Belfast, for the bitterness that is born of bigotry and religious intolerance. Without qualification he stated to that immense body of men, that Gladstone's purpose is to hand over the Protestants of Belfast and of all Ulster to the Catholics of Ireland, to be persecuted! At the same meeting a Methodist preacher advised the Protestants of Ulster to arise in open and armed revolt in case the Home Rule bill shall pass into law; and he preached from his pulpit that it will be the religious duty of the Protestants of Ulster to resist, by force of arms, the execution of the Home Rule law. Johnston, a member of the British Parliament and Grand Master of the Orangemen of Ulster, called and presided at an open meeting of his followers, and said to them that "there has been no crisis in

Ireland so grave since James II." He had bibles circulated among the audience and called on every man present to solemnly swear to resist Home Rule "even should they have to fight over again the Battle of the Boyne."

But, we regret to say, such manifestations of Protestant bigotry and hatred are not confined to Ulster. The correspondents of American daily papers inform us that in the Catholic provinces also manifestations of the old Protestant spirit are not infrequent, and that even men who have until now been adherents of the Liberal party are pretending to believe that it Home Rule become law the Protestants of Ireland will be persecuted by their Catholic fellow subjects. This is surprising, and as sad as it is surprising.

We think we may say without fear of contradiction, that the history of Ireland since the date of the enfranchisement of the Catholics of that country, does not furnish one instance of the persecution of a Protestant by the Catholics,—though the old spirit of Protestant ascendancy prompted acts and courses which many times irritated Catholics. We believe that no people ever existed who are so remarkable as are the Catholics of Ireland for the absence of the spirit that prompts to religious persecution. In the Catholic province of Munster, in which, of course, there are many Protestants, no manifestations of religious bitterness are ever heard of,—that is since the days of famine and "souperism," when the agents of the English Protestant missionary societies went from house to house insulting the poor Catholics in their poverty. In the cities of the three Catholic provinces, the highest civic offices are voluntarily shared between Catholics and Protestants. In the Catholic City of Cork, for example, where Protestants are but as one to seven of the population, the Mayoralty is frequently bestowed upon a Protestant, and until the Protestants in the City Council all arrayed themselves on the anti-national side of politics, the rule was to bestow the highest civic offices on a Protestant at least once in three years. It is but a year ago that the Catholics of the Council and of the city at large joined in recommending a Protestant merchant to the Lord Lieutenant for the office of High Sheriff. Indeed, throughout the Catholic provinces the relations existing between Catholics and Protestants have always been those of kindness and mutual good will—except when the old, dormant spirit of Protestant ascendancy was roused by some Protestant preacher.

In Ulster, however, the spirit of Protestant hatred has always ruled the land. The Protestantism of that province has always been of the Orange kind,—and that is, of its very nature, a persecuting kind. In its chief city, Belfast, a Catholic has never been permitted to hold public office. Some of the most estimable people in that busy city are Catholics, they are leading merchant, large taxpayers,—in fact, in every way worthy of public esteem; but not one of these has ever been called to the Mayor's chair, or to a seat in the City Council. The Protestants of the city act towards them as if the Emancipation Act had never passed. The great metropolis of Protestant England elects a Catholic to the highest office in its gift, that of Lord Mayor, and the Protestant Lord Chancellor of England welcomes him to office; but in Belfast a Catholic is as rigidly excluded from office as he would be in Boston in the time told in Hawthorne's "Scarlet Letter."

The hostility of the Ulster Protestants to Home Rule is not founded on their fear of persecution at the hands of Catholics. All Ireland knows, all the world knows, that they have no ground for such a fear. The real reason is, their desire to maintain Protestant ascendancy. The Home Rule bill itself gives the Protestants of Ireland every guarantee—too many, we think—against the practice of injustice or unfairness by Catholics. But, without any guarantees, and even if the bill placed in the hands of Catholics the power to persecute the Protestants at their pleasure, the Protestants would receive the fullest justice from their Catholic neighbors. Yes, we really believe that if the government of Ireland were placed in the sole control of Archbishop Walsh or Archbishop Croke, the Protestants of Ireland would receive their full rights; for, while the Protestants of Ulster are known, the world over, to be Protestant bigots *par excellence*, the Catholic prelates and priests of Ireland are as widely known to be the defenders of religious freedom, justice and fair play.—*New World.*

Literary Note.

Katherine Conway, one of the noblest workers in the Catholic journalistic field, (her "Watchwords from John Boyle O'Reilly" was a phenomenal success last year) will issue through Cupples of Boston, a book for the coming Easter Season, entitled, "A Dream of Lilies." Miss Conway has the happy faculty of hitting the taste of the public. She is fast becoming a universal favorite, and like Miss Procter, is as much liked by the better class of Protestant readers as she is revered by the entire Catholic world. The announcement of this new book has already brought to her publisher heavy advanced orders, compelling him to go to press with a second edition of it before a copy of the first is on the counters of the booksellers.