

by Archbishop Keble, is investigating the circumstances of the sudden and as yet unexplained cure which a daughter of Judge Bakewell, of this city, experienced some years ago. A hip disease, pronounced incurable by Drs. Boleyn and Gregory, was immediately eradicated by the application of a piece of the habit of Mother Bart. The result of the investigation will be forwarded to Rome to aid the effort which is being made to have her declared worthy of public devotion. Leo XII. approved her institute; may it be for Leo XIII. to crown her life!

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

Published Weekly at 401 and 403 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
Editor—REV. GEO. H. NORTHGRAVE, Esq., Author of "Mysteries of Modern Ireland."
Manager—THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor.
Messrs. DONAT CROW, LUKE KING and JOHN NICH are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transmit all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.
Agent for Ottawa—P. J. Coffey, Esq.
Agent for Alexandria, Glenora and London—Mr. Donald A. McDonald.
Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion.
Approved by the Bishop of London, and recommended by the Archbishop of St. Boniface, the Bishops of Ottawa, Hamilton, Kingston, and Peterboro, and leading Catholic Clergy men throughout the Dominion.

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., April 14th, 1888.

We are happy to be able to announce that His Lordship Bishop Walsh is rapidly regaining strength, and in a short time will leave New York for his episcopal city.

NEW DEVELOPMENTS.

One of the most noteworthy events of the discussion on Mr. Parnell's Arrears' Bill, was the position taken by Mr. T. W. Russell, who has hitherto been the most servile supporter of the Coercionist Government. In the debate on Mr. Parnell's Arrears' Bill, he displayed a sudden and unexpected independence, declaring himself utterly disgusted with the Coercion policy, and advocating Mr. Parnell's Bill with unlooked-for vehemence. Ulster had, without Mr. Russell, a majority of one in the house favorable to the Nationalist cause, but Mr. Russell's attitude indicates that Protestant Ulster is fast opening its eyes to the fact that Ireland's cause is not the cause of Catholicity against Protestantism, but that of a people kept in abject poverty and suffering by an oppressive landlordism, independently of the religious tenets of the oppressed.

Mr. Russell told the House that he would vote against the Government on Mr. Parnell's bill, and that he would entirely forget his own party, (the Liberal Unionists), with whom he had voted hitherto. The Conservatives, he said, had displayed the utmost indifference to the welfare of the Irish people, and the landlords had been mercilessly faithful to duty, issuing ejectment notices by wholesale.

Their conduct is the danger which threatened to dissolve the Union between England and Ireland, and which bodes ruin and destruction to the people of the latter country. He had voted before to make evictions easy to the landlords, because he trusted that they would be discreet, but he would never again trust to their discretion. With shame, he acknowledged, "that he was himself partly responsible for the shower of eviction notices which had recently fallen upon the Irish tenants, like a mild April shower indeed, but they would blossom into a November hurricane of evictions."

He quoted numerous instances in which landlords had entered eviction suits against their tenants because the latter had entered the Courts to obtain the modicum of justice which the Courts are willing to grant. Col. Sanderson asked for the names, but Mr. Russell answered: "Ah, the hon. gentleman always refuses to give names when he is asked for them from the Irish benches. I will not give names in this case because I am unwilling to place any Irish tenants under the mercy of Irish landlords."

The Liberals and Nationalists loudly cheered Mr. Russell, while the Conservatives and Liberal Unionists gave vent to angry murmurs. Mr. Chamberlain, especially, was much annoyed, as Mr. Russell formally thus repudiated his leadership.

Mr. Russell's concluding words were uttered with peculiar vehemence, though, indeed, it was difficult to say that one part was more vigorously delivered than another, in a speech which was throughout characterized with extraordinary earnestness and vigor. He said:

"You will have to-day a sight never before witnessed in this house. You will have all the members from Ireland, save and except the landlord party, for Cork, while you will have the Liberal and Radical Unionists, going into the other lobby to buttress up the worst phase of Irish landlordism which has cursed Ireland since the days of the Tudors, and which will repeat the Union, as sure as you live."

Dozens of Liberals crowded round Mr. Russell when he sat down to congratulate him on his own and Mr. Lea's conversion to the side of the Irish tenantry. Mr. Lea having seconded him in his course.

If these two remain faithful to the Nationalist cause, the Ulster majority for Tenant Right and Home Rule will be

free in the present house; and, certainly, if vehemence and vigor are any indication of strong conviction, Mr. Russell and Mr. Lea will persevere in the course which they have thus marked out for themselves.

The Pope has been hitherto the great bugbear which the opponents of Home Rule flaunted before the eyes of the Ulster Orangemen to divert them from taking sides with the Nationalists. They were told by Mr. Chamberlain, and Lord Salisbury and Hartington, that Home Rule means Rome Rule, and such minor lights as the Rev. J. D. Fulton in Toronto, have repeated this to satiety. But the Ulster people will not long be hoodwinked by such pretences. They must discover that it is not the Pope who is evicting them from their homesteads, and as straws show which way the wind blows, the bold utterances of Mr. Russell, which are, undoubtedly, the expression of the opinions of a class, prove that the hold which the Tory Government have hitherto had on the people of Ulster is relaxing. They will no longer be able to boast of the "loyalty" of Ulster; meaning by "loyalty" a readiness to submit to tyrannical measures emanating from alien rulers at Westminster.

The Nationalist Press are not over jubilant, however, at Mr. Russell's course. They are justified by his antecedents in looking with suspicion on his sudden conversion to their side. £1000 per annum have just been voted as Col. King Harman's salary for filling a post which he has until now filled through pure patriotism (!) and it is known that Mr. Russell desired this post, with the salary. It is, therefore, quite possible, that Mr. Russell is throwing the dice to gain a prize! In a letter to the Times he seems to throw out a hint that he is purchasable still by the Combination Cabinet. He says:

"If the Union is to be maintained in the interests of Irish landlordism and Castle officialism, I shall speedily make my mind up about the Union. If, on the contrary, the Union is to be maintained for the benefit of the whole people, and if Parliament will remember that there are loyal tenantry, loyal artisans, loyal traders, and loyal laborers, as well as loyal landlords, then I shall continue to fight for the Union."

Will the Government pay him a price such as he requires? It is possible they may do so to bring him back to his allegiance; but whether they do so or not, the ball has been set rolling in Protestant Ulster, the Protestant tenantry have been told that their best interests are linked with the National cause, and even Mr. Russell's delinquency and recency to the cause of which he has declared himself from henceforth a determined adherent, may not be sufficient to stem the torrent which he has put in motion.

On Mr. Parnell's bill, the Government majority was only 85, notwithstanding that several of the opposition are kept from voting by being detained in Mr. Balfour's jails. The hundred, and more, in which they gloried at the opening of the present Parliament has significantly dwindled down.

THE TABLES TURNED.

In the extermination campaign on the Luggacurran estates of Lord Lansdowne, last spring, a forge belonging to Edward Whelan, a blacksmith, was seized by His Lordship. Mr. Whelan brought an action for its recovery, as his rent had always been paid. Lord Lansdowne put in the plea that the forge was on his property and that he had a right to retain possession. The action resulted in a verdict for Mr. Whelan, and on St. Patrick's day the sheriff gave Mr. Whelan possession of the forge. A large crowd of people assembled to witness "Lord Lansdowne's eviction," and Mr. Whelan was loudly cheered on resuming possession of the forge.

JUDGE OLIVIER.

We are happy to inform our readers that the choice of the government has fallen on Mr. L. A. Olivier, of Ottawa, to fill the vacant County Judgeship of Prescott and Russell. Mr. Olivier is a young French Canadian lawyer of great talent, a native of the County of Russell, an alumnus of the College of Ottawa, and a gentleman enjoying the widest measure of popularity in the whole Ottawa Country. Judge Olivier combines with profound legal knowledge and accurate acquaintance with the French and English languages, an uprightness and sense of honor that will make him an invaluable magistrate. We congratulate our friend on his promotion and wish him many long years of judicial life. We are furthermore happy to announce, in connection with Judge Olivier's appointment, that his successor at the bar of Ottawa will be our clever and scholarly young friend Mr. M. J. Gorman, formerly of Pembroke. Mr. Gorman, as possessor of the same excellent qualities and qualifications that won for Mr. Olivier early prominence and rapid promotion, will admirably fill the vacancy that the latter gentleman's elevation to the Bench has made. Assiduous, honorable and up-

right, our young friend deserves the hearty support and encouragement of the people of Ottawa, to whom we earnestly commend him as the deservedly chosen and eminently fitted successor of the newly-appointed and universally-respected Judge of the United Counties of Prescott and Russell.

THE FRIENDS OF IRELAND.

At a banquet given in Cannon Street Hotel on St. Patrick's night, in reply to the toast "the friends of Ireland," Canon Byrne, of Boston, made an eloquent speech. He said he remembered the time when hardly one Boston paper would say a good word for Home Rule, but now there is hardly a paper that is not favorable to Ireland's cause. The change he attributes to Mr. Gladstone, who has induced thousands of Americans to study the Irish question, and to study it necessarily results in making advocates for Ireland's cause. Mr. Richard Eves responded on behalf of Ireland's English friends. He said that the more the English people know of Ireland, the more they sympathize with the sorely down-trodden people of that country.

J. D. FULTON IN TORONTO.

The melodious Justin D. Fulton is prosecuting his anti-Catholic lecture course in Toronto. To the credit of the Toronto press, it must be said, that, knowing as they did the man's antecedents, they gave him, on the whole, that cool reception which he deserves. Even the Mail, though, perhaps, at first, willing to give him some encouragement, grew disgusted with his filth and falsehood, and latterly abstained from giving him the full amount of free advertising which at first it seemed willing to accord to him. This excited Dr. Fulton's ire, and on Tuesday, the 3rd inst., he expressed his "indignation at the press of Toronto for having stated that certain portions of his lecture on Monday evening were unfit for publication." The Mail's report of his lecture adds, "that throughout the evening the eloquent divine (!) read a lecture to the newspapers of the city, declaring that he never found a place where there is such a cringing fear of Rome as in Toronto."

He then asked the ladies who had been present the previous evening to hold up their hands if they considered his remarks as unfit for publication. Of course, he knew well that any ladies capable of appreciating what is fit to be listened to, and who might have been present hearing such remarks, at the former, would not be at the succeeding lecture, so that he was perfectly safe in making this appeal. No hands were held up to condemn him, and this, forthwith, is regarded by him as a glorious vindication!

The Mail of the 5th inst. had an editorial in reply to Dr. Fulton's abuse of the press. This article says significantly: Dr. Fulton "asserts that the papers are afraid of the influence of the Roman Catholic Church. It would, perhaps, be more correct to say that they are afraid of the moral influence of his lectures upon their readers." Coming from the Mail this is indeed an unkind cut. As to the subject on which Dr. Fulton spoke, and the manner in which he maintained his position, the Mail adds: "So far as we can see, he confines himself mainly to hurling charges of immorality against priests and nuns. That sort of invective serves no good purpose. It lacks the essential element of fair play."

The editor explains that such a mode of procedure can have no result either in the conversion of Catholics to Protestantism, or the prevention of Protestants from becoming Catholics, for "the humblest Catholic layman is, from the nature of the case, a more competent judge (of this matter) than any Protestant polemist." Also: "Every intelligent person, whatever his creed may be, knows of his own common sense, that in this age, the Roman Catholic Church could not endure for twelve months were her altars manned by adulterers, or her convents peopled with harlots."

Thus the Mail gives the lie direct to Mr. Fulton. That journal, however, has a matter at heart on which he would like some information from the liar, if he has any to give. It would like to be enlightened as regards how the increasing influence of the French-Canadians in our Dominion can be counteracted. If Mr. Fulton will only give light on this subject, the Mail agrees to take him to his embrace with all his faults:

"We shall be grateful to Dr. Fulton if he can give us any hints or suggestions regarding this matter. But if he has nothing better to offer than obscenities about priests and nuns, then, with all respect to his cloth, he may as well go back to Brooklyn."

In short, if Mr. Fulton will only take his cue from the Mail, that journal will enthusiastically exclaim with Anthony Chuzzlewit: "I taught him. I trained him. This is the heir of my bringing up. I worked for this: I hoped for this; it has been the great end and aim of my life."

Against the slanders of this Fulton, it is unnecessary to say one word in defence of the pious and self-sacrificing ladies who

have devoted their lives in Catholic convents, to the purposes of charity and benevolence towards all. Their works speak for themselves, and have brought forth acknowledgments even from their bitterest enemies, concerning their disinterested zeal. The English soldiers of the Crimea, and the Americans engaged in the great civil war are equally ready to attest the heroic virtues exhibited by devoted nuns, whether on the battlefields, in the hospitals, or in their oratories. We shall, however, append the following letter from a well known gentleman of Toronto, a Methodist, who does justice both to the nuns and to J. D. Fulton:

DR. FULTON'S MISSION.

To the Editor of the Mail.
Sir,—Rev. J. D. Fulton, D. D., of Brooklyn, N. Y., comes here ostensibly as one whose mission is to preach the "glad tidings" of the Christian religion—but really to find in Toronto audiences a receptacle for the vilest character of filth this people have ever been called on to witness. His main object here, as throughout the greater part of his life, is to attack the institutions of the Roman Catholic Church, sparing not even the defenceless Sisters connected with the various convents of the country. The first principles of manly gallantry should have prompted this man to hesitate long before he degraded and insulted imagination had reached these self-sacrificing women with his accursed insinuations.

I may say, although I have no doubt the fact is well known, that I am a Protestant, and will yield to no man in my allegiance and veneration for the simple truths of the plan of salvation as understood in the Methodist denomination. But if my religion could find any strength or sustenance in such rhetorical carriages as Dr. Fulton presents to his hearers, I would utterly despair of any sanctifying results following in the wake of the Gospel of Christ. A defence from my hands of any of the institutions of the Roman Catholic Church is unnecessary. The great mass of the Protestant public in this country have learned to respect them. Of the Sisters of Charity (whom Dr. Fulton refers to as the nuns) I know as the Christian people of Canada know that where poverty, misery, sickness and death most do congregate, there are to be found these noble women, ministering in kindness and love, without fee or reward, and putting to shame the philanthropic efforts of many Protestant communities. It is impossible that in the hearts of such could exist the wickedness and sin charged by this itinerant vendor of infamous falsehood. Protestants and Catholics in this country have long since learned to respect each other, and the Protestants owe it to themselves to mark with contempt the utterances of such as this so-called Christian minister of Brooklyn. Toronto seems to be the dumping ground for American swindlers, defaulters, thieves and blacklegs. Their company, in their section, has a more elevating influence than reverend gentlemen of the character of the subject of this communication. If further evidence is desired as to the questionable purity of mind of Dr. Fulton it is found in the circumstance surrounding his efforts to have a certain work published in Boston. The publishers, upon being interviewed by Dr. Fulton, entered into a contract to print a book for him without reading the manuscript. It was sent to the composing room. Early the following day the manager was informed that the Boston compositors had refused to set the type, so utterly filthy and obscene was the composition. The doctor was informed of the state of affairs and the copy was returned to him. He threatened the publishers with an action for breach of contract, but when told to "go ahead" wisely refrained. Since his arrival in Toronto publishers here have refused to put in print his filthy literature. It is high time the mask was drawn from off the face of such debased immorality. He and his false and disgusting utterances are more becoming the house of the "strange women" than the platform of any public hall in this city.

Yours, etc.,
W. T. R. PRESTON,
Toronto, April 2.

Mr. Preston's letter makes it unnecessary to say more on this subject. However, we may remark that there are Torontonians who identify themselves with the infamous Fulton, by endorsing his black calumnies. Of Inspector Jas. Hughes and Thos. N. Duntney we have already spoken in our columns. Since the appearance of Mr. Preston's letter, Dr. Wilde and City Commissioner Coatsworth have made themselves his boon companions, and in the Mail of the 5th inst. Chas. Hudson endorses him as one "who has sacrificed a good position and a comfortable home to tell us the truth."

Dr. Fulton's complaints that some of his city audiences have not contributed sufficient to pay his expenses are enough to show to what extent the spirit of self-sacrifice actuates him. It is a noble testimony to the grand character of the Catholic Church, that only such men as this Fulton can be induced to preach Popery crusades.

FALSE PRETENCES.

The following, from the Philadelphia American, will show what Americans think of the Coercionist pretence that if Ireland were to have Home Rule, the Protestant minority would be persecuted. This is the bugaboo which is persistently brought forward to scare the timid old women of England, and "Protestant Ulster," wherever that is:

"It is assumed by Protestant alarmists that every country in which Roman Catholicism have the majority must witness the same intolerance of the Protestant minority as characterized the era of the Counter-Reformation. It is taken for granted that while the spirit of the age has put an end to the parallel intolerance in Protestant countries—to the penal laws against Irish

Roman Catholics for instance—that no such change has been wrought in Roman Catholic countries. This argument is used freely in opposition to allowing Ireland Home Rule. It might be asked to what unfairness the Protestant minority of Belgium has been subjected since that country cut loose from Protestant Holland in 1830? Austria is a case equally notable. Nineteen-twentieths of the people of the Austrian provinces are Roman Catholics. A member of the national legislature has proposed a law, which would make Roman Catholicism the basis of public education, though not to nearly the same extent as the penal laws made the creed of the Episcopal Church the basis of public education in Ireland. He would not make it penal for any but Roman Catholics to open a school, as those laws made it penal for any but Protestants. But he would enact that the catechism of that Church be taught to all the schools supported by the State. Yet the bill has not the remotest chance of becoming a law. The most ardent Roman Catholics deplore it as ill advised and inopportune. The majority simply scorn the proposal."

ST. PETER IN ROME.

There is a class of Protestant polemist who are constantly proclaiming their insatiable longing for truth, yet who love to maintain any thesis, however preposterous, which will, as they imagine, give trouble to Catholics to refute it. Not long since, Dr. Kellogg, a Presbyterian minister of Toronto, in a sermon against the Pope's supremacy, on which we at the time made some comments, admitted that the words of Christ "on this rock I will build my Church," refer to St. Peter, as indeed they evidently do. However, the Doctor found a host of adversaries who rose up against him with letters in the papers, declaring that this was yielding too much to Rome. In a letter dated 5th March, Dr. Kellogg answered one of these writers thus:

"Perhaps I may misapprehend these words, but they seem to me to express a principle fatal to all candid interpretation of Scripture. I may say that I have not the slightest sympathy with that old dogmatic school of interpretation which subordinated interpretation to dogma. . . . I would therefore never bring myself to any of any interpretation that, because of its supposed bearing on any dogma, it should never be given upon any grounds whatever."

Notwithstanding this fair declaration, Dr. Kellogg, in another part of his sermon, endeavors to make it appear that St. Peter was not in Rome, at least during the life of St. Paul, though he says "there is some reason from tradition to believe" that "after the martyrdom of Paul" he was there. Dr. Justin B. Fulton has also been indoctrinating his Toronto audiences with the notion that St. Peter was never in Rome, and the assertion was duly applauded.

Of course the object of this is to make it appear that the line of Supreme Pontiff, the successors of St. Peter as Bishop of Rome, are but a myth, with no claim to the successorship to St. Peter. As the subject is of great interest to Catholics, in view of the Pope's succession to St. Peter, we propose to say a few words here concerning it.

Dr. Kellogg will have it that St. Peter's visit to Rome was, according to tradition, after St. Paul's martyrdom. He concedes then, that St. Paul was martyred at Rome, and this is, truly, what tradition attests. But the same tradition attests that St. Peter first preached the Gospel there, and that he too was martyred in the same persecution with St. Paul, and even that the martyrdom of the two Apostles took place on the same day.

The undeniable testimony of the early Fathers and of extant monuments of the catacombs is to this effect and to the effect that these two Apostles were co-laborers in establishing the Church in Rome. St. Leo the Great speaks of this as a well-known fact: "O Rome, Peter and Paul were the two heroes by whom the light was all at once made to shine to your view. . . . they are your august fathers, your venerable pastors. To them you owe the honor of your heavenly birth. . . . Peter and Paul alone have conferred on you this high dignity, have rendered you the holy nation, the chosen people, the sacerdotal and royal city." St. Leo was Pontiff, A. D. 440.

St. Gregory I. states that certain Eastern Christians came to Rome to claim the bones of these two apostles as a treasure belonging to their country. They were in the act of bearing the relics with them, and had deposited them for the night in one of the catacombs outside the city, when they were so terrified by a convulsion of the elements, that they abandoned their project, and the Romans replaced them piously on the spot where they remain to this day.

Pope Damasus, who was Pontiff in A. D. 366, relates these same facts in verse, in an inscription which contains his name as the writer; and the spot on which stands the glorious Church of St. Paul outside the walls of Rome is the very spot where Constantine the Great erected a Church on this Apostles' tomb, and the spot where the grandest of all basilicas is erected over the tomb of St. Peter, in the same on which St. Helen, the mother of Constantine, built a temple in honor of the prince of

the Apostles. There is, in fact, through all the catacombs, the constantly recurring representation of these two apostles, united in life and death, which proves that there was always in the Christian Roman mind a reason for uniting the two in one veneration, which did not exist in the case of other saints, unless they were closely united in the same work, in life and death. This tradition is confirmed by the Roman Martyrology which relates the martyrdom of both in Rome on 29th of June, A. D. 66. It is, therefore, difficult to understand why Dr. Kellogg should agree with the tradition and history which tell of St. Paul's martyrdom, while he rejects the equally conclusive evidence that St. Peter suffered also in Rome during the same general persecution in which Nero caused so many Christians to be put to death. There is the same evidence for both events, and there is absolutely no testimony to show either that St. Peter survived St. Paul, or that he died elsewhere, whether by martyrdom or from natural causes. It would make this article too long to enumerate all the proofs of St. Peter's episcopate in Rome. However, we may mention briefly a few.

St. Irenaeus says that "Peter first (that is before Paul) opened the gate of the heavenly kingdom in Rome by the preaching of the Gospel." This testimony of itself is most conclusive, owing to the nearness of St. Irenaeus to the Apostles themselves and the consequent authenticity of the information possessed by this great Bishop, saint and scholar. Saints Epiphanius and Chrysostom give equally forcible testimony, as also Leo I., Theodoret, the Emperor Theodosius and Paul Orosius.

Eusebius, the father of Church History, says: "Nero sought the death of the Apostles first, as the leaders and standard-bearers of God's people. Paul he condemned to be beheaded, and Peter to be crucified. I consider it unnecessary to seek for testimonies to these facts, for their attestation is to be seen to this day in the remarkable and resplendent monuments which attest them." (Ch. Hist.)

We hear it said, sometimes, and Dr. Kellogg states this as a serious objection to St. Peter's having been in Rome, that the Scripture does not speak of his presence there. If this were the case, the objection would have very little weight, for the Scripture nowhere professes to give a full history of St. Peter; though much of St. Paul's career is given by his companion St. Luke in the Acts of the Apostles, as well as in his own Epistles.

However, there are two very clear references to St. Peter's being in Rome found in Holy Scripture.

From Acts xxviii, 15, we learn that when St. Paul went to Rome to preach the Gospel the brethren who were already in Rome came forth to meet him, and he thanked God for their affectionate reception of him, which gave him great courage." In St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, 1. 8, the flourishing state of religion in Rome is spoken of by that Apostle in the most eulogistic style. Who, then, preached the Gospel in Rome, before St. Paul, if not St. Peter, whom all Tradition points out as the first to have done so? To the testimonies already given, concerning this fact, we may add that of Papias, who being a disciple of the Apostles, and a priest of Rome, was certainly cognizant of facts of which he was an eye and ear witness. Eusebius takes from the writings of Papias the statement that "Peter in his first Epistle, which was written from Rome, mentions Mark, and that he calls Rome Babylon, saying 'the church that is at Babylon salute you, and so doth Marcus my son.'" 1 Pet. v. 13.

Other early fathers give similar testimony. St. Jerome expressly states that the Babylon here spoken of is Rome, that is, Pagan Rome, just as St. John in the Apocalypse speaks of Pagan Rome under the same name Babylon. This passage of St. Peter is, therefore, the third passage of Holy Writ in which St. Peter's presence in Rome is attested, and not obscurely. Dr. Kellogg is therefore in this guilty of the same distortion of the sense of scripture for which he so strongly censures others.

REV. JUSTIN B. FULTON.

The Toronto Ministerial Association have taken under its patronage the obscene book-writer of Brooklyn. At their meeting on Monday last he was introduced to the association, and the report states that he "gave an interesting sketch of his work toward the conversion of Roman Catholics. A cordial vote of thanks to the speaker was then unanimously carried." After which "the meeting was closed with the benediction by Rev. E. A. Stafford."

It is, however, pleasing to notice that not all the Protestant clergy are so lost to decency as to lend encouragement, either to the man, or to the falsehoods he is known to be propagating. The Christian Register of Boston, a Unitarian paper, thus speaks of him, and respectable Protestants echo these sentiments:

"We confess to our Catholic contemporary the deep sense of humiliation which Mr. Fulton's course awakens. We assure it that his blatant sensationalism, his arrogant bigotry and his coarse attacks upon the Little Sisters of the Poor are as

thoroughly distasteful to number of Protestants as Catholics. Indeed there is which Mr. Fulton can hardly believe which is quite as Protestantism must suffer casualty."

CATHOLICITY IN

The Jubilee offering from the Pope has excited ultra Presbyterians in Edinburgh Seceders whose violation of the solemn Church and nation, regiven." This is on a part of some of the Presbyterians and the United States, or recognition given to the Princes of the Church or by high civil dignitaries shows that the spirit of not altogether extinct. Imagine their little constitute the Church whose acceptable to heaven! In case, truly the promise ham and to Isaac and to which St. Paul tells us filled in Christ, by knowledge and efficacy have had small fruit! I shall all the nations blessed."

Scotland itself appears its Presbyterianism, R. icised, the Inspiration being freely denied, it being abandoned! yet flourishing more surely

In 1778, not more than

lies used to assemble holy Mass celebrate eminent Bishop Ha about forty in the ci in Inverness shire, 77 and in the shire of Mor are now in Glasgow city attended by 63 priests there are now se 16 priests, and in Mor two parishes with 20 Scotland there are 281 000 Catholics, so that tioned in the above sta over 1000 souls in ex increase is more in ex able increase of the I when under persecution God, "multiplied and strong." The Edinbu rest assured that "the enor the Catholic Church, w for the See of Peter, dying out in "bonnie"

With pleasure we see the people of Scotland no sympathy with the tions of the Edinburgh

CATHOLIC EL

The necessity of C dependently even of, religious education, our children, has been in Meriden, Connect School of that town is cally "non-sectarian"; teachers, Miss Joseph the teaching of the C of the vile misrepres so frequently found in cal writings. Miss C withdraw her false reiterating and defon Thus are "non sectari against the Catholic re authorities support Catholics of Meriden mined to build a h selves, and to support cause there will be t indignation among Catholics there pres school of their own religion will be taught

A similar case has tral Grammar School The teacher there, b from anti Catholic oft-told lies concern this case she endeav smooth by stating th allowed to defend th Catholics must eit sulted, or they must a Babel, the result likely be the subvers faith in the minds of these.

Precisely the sar occurred in Ontar lic Separate Schools If it does not occur reason is that teach aware that Catholics their own hands: the Catholic child practically attending Even of those who ing the Public Scho are attending such wherein the children their religion.

From such facts that those few nom endeavoring to thr way of making the they are intended to