

# The Catholic Record.

"CHRISTIANUS MIHI NOMEN EST, CATHOLICUS VERO COGNOMEN."—"CHRISTIAN IS MY NAME, BUT CATHOLIC MY SURNAME."—St. Pacian, 4th Century.

VOL. 4.

LONDON, ONT., FRIDAY, FEB. 17, 1882.

NO. 175

## CLERICAL.

**WE have received a large stock of goods suitable for clerical garments.**  
We give in our tailoring department special attention to this branch of the trade.

**N. WILSON & CO.**

CATHOLIC PRESS.

The Independent considers that it is nonsense to condemn indiscriminate reading. It says—  
"Such a free public library as Boston has is a blessing whose value cannot be over estimated, even though a Catholic paper of this city, the Freeman's Journal, speaking of the effort made by a number of the leading citizens of this city to secure such a library, says—

"The truth is that the spirits of unrest, dissatisfaction, discontent and envy do most harm in a community given up to indiscriminate reading. The reading disease is an evil which promises, with Rev. John Hall and the rest to help it, to become a plague."

"But such nonsense is hardly worth quoting."  
The Independent ought to think before it speaks, but it does not. A public library, under proper supervision and censorship, might be an advantage in most communities; but a public library, packed with such books as publishers, catering to the popular taste, choose to issue, is a pest-house from which infection is borne by every wind. It can not be expected that the Independent can comprehend that the books of "history," science and light literature given out with so much complacency by the managers of free libraries, fill the mind of every well-instructed Catholic with horror.

The managers of free libraries would be condemned as narrow-minded if they excluded Froide's "histories" from their shelves. Yet no books could be more instrumental in perverting young persons' ideas of the drift of past events than these. The late Dr. Draper's "Conflict of Science and Religion" would, addressed to a general of Indian Affairs, be sent to that office up to the 1st of March, 1882, for special Indian Supplies, and the Northwest of March, 1882, for wine, Ogen, Cows, elements, Tools, &c. full particulars requested can be had by writing up to do so, or to the Indian P&K.

Accompanied by an American Bank for an amount of the ten-der of current, and very declines to endorse upon to do so, the super-contracted accepted the cheque under not necessarily insert without special AKNOTGHNET. the superintendent of Indian Affairs. 174-4w

formerly Travelling agent, and will be d by it to be hono- r."—N. Y. Freeman's

D. EGAN, HOLIC AGENCY nd 8 Park Place. YORK.

established in 1875, for as the Agent of any ive time, money and will purchase any kind will execute any busi- ness matter needing individual attention. reputably well known and manufacturers ited States, that it can duction to its patrons. ment to Ladies. ing, and will be d by it to be hono- r."—N. Y. Freeman's

174-5w-cow & Munro SSORS TO SMITH & CO., COERS, IRIT MERCHANTS, ST., LONDON.

ldest and most extensive ario. The business will e same money as for- ers may rest assured that and prices will be such Houses that popularly nder the former owner-

& MUNRO. R WANTED. ED, for Sep. 8, 8, No. 10, Houses that popularly F. O. Applicants state E. C. MCINTYRE, Sec. Bornish P. O. Ont.

**Catholic Review.**  
WRITING of Mgr. Comboni, recalls our attention to a charming story he related in *Mission Catholique*, and which we find again in the *Annals of Our Lady of the Sacred Heart*. It is the history of the flower of Nigritia, the white pearl of a black race. It is a marvellous narrative, not more wonderful for its wonderful physical than for its spiritual phenomena. "For the last four years," wrote Mgr. Comboni, "the missionaries of El Obied have had among their neophytes, a young girl about 15 years of age, whose parents are negroes, and strange to say, her own skin is white, and her complexion rose." Her original name was Lermina, which has been retained as a surname, this being the custom at the mission, when a catechumen is baptized. On the 13th of June, 1879, the child was regenerated in the sacrament of baptism, under the patronage of St. Blanche, by Dom Fracaso, Superior of Kordofan. Her father, Nungina, and her mother, Gen Jide, are jet black. Nungina is a ferocious slave trader who has enriched himself by kidnapping helpless creatures for the purpose of selling them. During one of his barbarous excursions, a rival slave dealer robbed him of his favorite child. After a protracted journey through forests, wherein roamed lions and other wild beasts, Lermina was captured by a party of soldiers, and taken to a place of safety. She was presented to His Excellency Gordon Pacha, who, on his way through El Obied, left her at our mission. Much time was consumed before she could acquire any knowledge of the truths of religion; however, as soon as the light dawned upon her soul, she became a most devoted Catholic, and her devotion to the Blessed Virgin is truly touching. On the eve of the feast of Our Holy Mother, Lermina takes no nourishment whatever. She is endowed with extraordinary humility, and on different occasions, when urged to eat some of the bread baked for the Sisters, which is coarse food at the best, but more of a dainty than the fare prepared for the Orphans, Blanche would persistently refuse the proffered luxury. "It is not proper," she was wont to say, "that a poor slave should taste of the Sister's bread, for they are free." "But, my child, you have been baptized, and you also are free!" "Assuredly I am free because I have the happiness to be a Christian; but I was born a pagan, and it would not be right for me to partake of the same food as the Sisters, who have always been Christians. The bread of the negro is free library, and I would only be too well pleased to be a servant to these good Sisters." Now and then, when struggling to overcome an obstacle or when a companion destroys anything that she has in charge, her former unchristian habits betray itself, but these outbreaks of rare occurrence, and are speedily quelled by the thought of God. The pious teachings infused in her soul soon restore meekness and patience to her angered spirit. Towards the sick and the little negroes, Blanche is like unto an angel of charity, and she is ever ready to deny herself any thing that will promote their comfort or pleasure. Her profound admiration for the Sisters who have left home, parents, friends, and given up all worldly joys for the sake of serving the cause of charity, has inspired her with an ardent desire to follow their example. She has already rejected two offers of marriage. A young man from the equatorial provinces possessing the same physical peculiarities as Blanche Lermina, was assigned to Gordon Pacha, who, taking for granted that this youth would prove an acceptable suitor to his former protegee, sent him to the mission of El Obied with a military escort, but Blanche would not so much as look at her young countryman. Another party was presented by Dom Leon Lesi, a missionary of wide experience, and met with no better success; the firm determination of Blanche being, evidently, prompted by an earnest motive. She clearly stated her resolution to consecrate herself to Jesus Christ alone, and said that she longed to pass the rest of her life with the Sisters, and to be the humble servant of these holy women. For our own edification, and for the propagation of the faith in Central Africa, we hope that Divine Providence will grant a long life to this sacrificing virgin. It would appear that the malediction which has pursued the children of Ham has not touched this purely. The sweetest, the most fragrant flower grown in the mission of Nigritia!"

**Buffalo Union.**  
It is no ascetic priest in the confessional or pulpit that speaks as follows, but a Rochester man of the world who in a correspondence to the Sunday News of this city responds to this note of warning:

"I warn all mothers and fathers to keep their daughters from the public dance and balls which are in abundance this winter. Ninety-nine out of every hundred girls who go to wreck to-day are ruined by dances or balls. Only two weeks ago a young fellow tried to chloroform a young lady at a dance. A girl goes to a dance and meets one of these handsome young men who are good dancers, and is attracted by him. He dances with her, and the dancing makes both warm, and he invites her to the wine-room to have refreshments, to which she goes with the intention of drinking a glass of ginger ale. But when reaching the wine-room she sees other girls drinking beer and she thinks she will take a drink of lager, which she does and two or three more during the evening, and when it is time to go home her brain is in a whirl. The young man grasps his opportunity, and inquires if she would like to go home in a "hack?" and she of course consents. It would be better if she never rode in the "hack," for her ruin will be completed when she reaches home. I can

name seven pretty girls, of good families, who would grace any young man's house as wives, ruined by such men.

**Boston Pilot.**  
Italy has saved so much by confiscating Church property and robbing the Pope that she can now support an army of two hundred and fifty thousand men, with three that number of reserves, and pay the interest on her debt besides; and we suppose nobody admits that a standing army is worth far more to a country than a lot of churches and schools.

The 13th of January was observed by the Protestant landlords of Ireland as "a day of humiliation." The sermons of the ministers were remarkable for a tone of leniency toward the tenant farmers. At least one sermon was remarkable for its plain speech to the landlords. The Archbishop of Kildare, Rev. M. F. de Burgh, delivered a special address in St. David's Church, Naas, in which he said—

"A struggle lies before us; a conflict which is likely to be long and difficult. And who, as he looks back on his past life, or as he recalls the times of his forefathers, can confidently say—I am clean, without transgression, I am innocent, neither is there iniquity in me? Not one! Let us confess to-day, that in the former days of our ascendancy we bore ourselves too proudly and too harshly. We learned too proudly to make to Peter, but mark well, it was never made to any of the other disciples, not even to 'James' or 'Paul.' If all the apostles were of equal authority, how is it that Christ built his church only on Peter. If all the apostles were of equal jurisdiction, how is it that Peter was the only disciple that received 'the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven?' (The 'Kingdom of Heaven' in Holy Scripture signifies the Church. See Math. XIII, 17, 24, 31, 33, 41, 44, 45, 51.)

Now the very fact that Christ gave Peter the keys of His Church or Kingdom signifies that He gave him the government of His Church. When a man gives or sells his house to another, he presents the receiver with the keys of the house, and by that very fact he transfers to him the government and management of the entire building. So, too, when Christ built His Church on Peter, and then gave him the keys of that Church, by that very fact he conferred the government and management of his entire Church on Peter. Now Peter was the only Apostle that received the keys of Christ's Church, therefore Peter was the only Apostle that received the government of Christ's Church.

All this clearly shows that Christ promised Peter the government of his Church, and Christ being God, must necessarily fulfill His promise. Now we will presently see that Christ did fulfill his promise after his resurrection.

In this connection I may remark that, between Christ's promise and its fulfillment Peter did not actually possess the government of Christ's Church; he only had a promise of it. Hence if we find Peter rebuking or denying his Lord, we should remember that Peter was not then governor of the Church, he was only a divinely-chosen candidate for that office; it was only after the resurrection when he became fully instructed and sanctified, that Christ fulfilled His promise and conferred the government of his Church on Peter.

Now in the 21st chapter of St. John's Gospel that Christ fulfilled his promise; in the 16th and 17th verses Christ said to Peter alone, "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep." The Greek word "poimaine" signified to feed or to govern (Ps. 111. 9. Ezekiel 34. 1, saith 44. 28.)

The "who sheep-fold" or Church, John X) is thus conlided to Peter alone. Christ here constituted Peter universal Pastor over his entire flock—not only the "lambs"—that is the people or faithful, but also the "sheep" that is the pastors of the Church. Peter is the universal pastor. If all the apostles had equal care over Christ's flock how is it that Peter alone was said the words of Christ, "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep?" Therefore Peter alone received the care or government of Christ's entire Church (John. 21. 16.) Therefore Christ fulfilled his promise of the government or primacy of his Church to Peter.

3. Peter acted as visible Primate of the Church. Whenever all the Apostles' names are mentioned Peter always stands first. (Math. X. 2; Mark II. 16; Luke VI. 14; Acts 1. 14) Peter alone had his name changed by Christ (Gen. I. 42) Who presided over the election of an Apostle to fill the place of Judas? It was Peter (Acts I. 15.) Peter is the first Apostle to perform a miracle (Acts III. 6.) Peter is the first to address the Jews in Jerusalem, while the other Apostles stand around (Acts II.) Peter was the first to convert the Gentiles (Acts X.) Christ prayed in a special manner for Peter (Luke 22. 32.) Peter alone received the keys of Christ's Church, (Matthew 16.) Therefore Peter was the only Apostle that received the government of Christ's entire Church.

Now I have cited more than 40 texts of Scripture, all of which prove that Christ gave the government of his entire Church to Peter. Yet Mr. Armstrong says this fact is not "supported by Scripture." Mr. Armstrong quotes only two texts (Revised Edition) to show that Peter was not Supreme Governor of the Church. But the same texts actually prove that Peter was Governor of the Church.

But let us analyze his argument. Here is the next text he argues from: "Paul withstood Peter to the face because he was to be blamed." (Gal. 2. 11.) Why did Paul withstand Peter? Because Peter did not wish to eat with the Gentiles. Every Bible reader knows that it was customary for the Jews not to eat with the Gentiles; hence, fearing lest "his eating with the Gentiles should scandalize the work of the Christian Church, but in this

ground-work (or principal foundation that supports all) is placed a "rock" (Math. 16. 18)—the secondary foundation—Peter, the instrument of God, that sustains the Church, holds it together, whilst the other Apostles also aid in supporting it, but in a different degree.

But let us reason still more closely. 1st. Christ promised Peter the Primacy of His Church. 2dly. Christ actually conferred the primacy on Peter; 3dly. Peter acted as visible primate over Christ's Church. 1st. Christ promised the supremacy of his Church to Peter.

This proposition is proved from the 16th Chapter of Matthew's Gospel, 13 and following verses: "And Jesus asked his disciples, saying 'Whom do men say that the son of man is?' But they said, some John the Baptist, and others some Elias, \* \* \* Jesus saith to them: 'But whom do ye say that I am?' Peter, as usual, is the leader and spokesman. 'Simon Peter answering saith: 'Thou art Christ, the son of the living God. And Jesus answering saith to him: 'Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona \* \* \* And I say to thee: That thou art Peter (or rock), and upon this rock (or Peter) I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it: and I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.' (The 'Kingdom of Heaven' in Holy Scripture signifies the Church. See Math. XIII, 17, 24, 31, 33, 41, 44, 45, 51.)

Now the very fact that Christ gave Peter the keys of His Church or Kingdom signifies that He gave him the government of His Church. When a man gives or sells his house to another, he presents the receiver with the keys of the house, and by that very fact he transfers to him the government and management of the entire building. So, too, when Christ built His Church on Peter, and then gave him the keys of that Church, by that very fact he conferred the government and management of his entire Church on Peter. Now Peter was the only Apostle that received the keys of Christ's Church, therefore Peter was the only Apostle that received the government of Christ's Church.

All this clearly shows that Christ promised Peter the government of his Church, and Christ being God, must necessarily fulfill His promise. Now we will presently see that Christ did fulfill his promise after his resurrection.

In this connection I may remark that, between Christ's promise and its fulfillment Peter did not actually possess the government of Christ's Church; he only had a promise of it. Hence if we find Peter rebuking or denying his Lord, we should remember that Peter was not then governor of the Church, he was only a divinely-chosen candidate for that office; it was only after the resurrection when he became fully instructed and sanctified, that Christ fulfilled His promise and conferred the government of his Church on Peter.

Now in the 21st chapter of St. John's Gospel that Christ fulfilled his promise; in the 16th and 17th verses Christ said to Peter alone, "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep." The Greek word "poimaine" signified to feed or to govern (Ps. 111. 9. Ezekiel 34. 1, saith 44. 28.)

The "who sheep-fold" or Church, John X) is thus conlided to Peter alone. Christ here constituted Peter universal Pastor over his entire flock—not only the "lambs"—that is the people or faithful, but also the "sheep" that is the pastors of the Church. Peter is the universal pastor. If all the apostles had equal care over Christ's flock how is it that Peter alone was said the words of Christ, "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep?" Therefore Peter alone received the care or government of Christ's entire Church (John. 21. 16.) Therefore Christ fulfilled his promise of the government or primacy of his Church to Peter.

3. Peter acted as visible Primate of the Church. Whenever all the Apostles' names are mentioned Peter always stands first. (Math. X. 2; Mark II. 16; Luke VI. 14; Acts 1. 14) Peter alone had his name changed by Christ (Gen. I. 42) Who presided over the election of an Apostle to fill the place of Judas? It was Peter (Acts I. 15.) Peter is the first Apostle to perform a miracle (Acts III. 6.) Peter is the first to address the Jews in Jerusalem, while the other Apostles stand around (Acts II.) Peter was the first to convert the Gentiles (Acts X.) Christ prayed in a special manner for Peter (Luke 22. 32.) Peter alone received the keys of Christ's Church, (Matthew 16.) Therefore Peter was the only Apostle that received the government of Christ's entire Church.

Now I have cited more than 40 texts of Scripture, all of which prove that Christ gave the government of his entire Church to Peter. Yet Mr. Armstrong says this fact is not "supported by Scripture." Mr. Armstrong quotes only two texts (Revised Edition) to show that Peter was not Supreme Governor of the Church. But the same texts actually prove that Peter was Governor of the Church.

But let us analyze his argument. Here is the next text he argues from: "Paul withstood Peter to the face because he was to be blamed." (Gal. 2. 11.) Why did Paul withstand Peter? Because Peter did not wish to eat with the Gentiles. Every Bible reader knows that it was customary for the Jews not to eat with the Gentiles; hence, fearing lest "his eating with the Gentiles should scandalize the work of the Christian Church, but in this

other hand, fearing an exodus of Gentiles "withhold or approved Peter for the want of tact." Did Paul ever contradict Peter's doctrine? No, never; on this occasion he merely disapproved of Peter's timidity or conduct. Now if Mr. Armstrong disapproved of Hon. E. Blake's conduct in prison, would it follow that Mr. Armstrong is Blake's superior? I think not. Did not St. Bernard (De consideratione) "withstand" Pope Eugenius? Yet Bernard never dreamed of denying that Pope's supremacy. Therefore Paul's "withstanding" Peter is no argument against Peter's supremacy. Paul mentions it as a fact worthy of record that "he actually withstood Peter." Does Paul ever tell us that he rebuked John or James or Andrew? No, because when an equal rebukes an equal the matter excites no special attention. But when an inferior rebukes a superior the fact is worthy of note, and that is the reason Paul tells us he withstood Peter. This is an "argumentum ad hominem" where in Armstrong's text actually prove Peter's supremacy over Paul.

(Mr. Armstrong quotes the Revised Testament. I wonder if he learned the Revised Lord's Prayer yet, it differs from the one his mother taught him.) In that very same chapter (Gal. I. 18) Paul says: "I went to Jerusalem to see Peter, and I tarried with him 15 days." Why? "Least I (Paul) should run or had run in vain." (Gal. 2. 2.) See, even Paul couldn't get along without Peter.

Let us knock the bottom out of Armstrong's second argument. He calls our attention to 75 chap. of the Acts and 5 following verses. From this text he wishes to infer that James presided over the council at Jerusalem. But here the tables are turned on him again. Let us read the Chapter: (V. 6) "And the Apostles and Ancients assembled to consider this matter. And when there had been much disputing (V. 7.) Peter rising up said to them: 'Men, brethren etc, 7, 8, 9, 10,' and after Peter laid down the doctrine what happened? "All the multitude held their tongues." Peter spoke and the much disputing ceased. Seeing that there was not a single dissenting voice, James seconded the motion, and accepted Peter's doctrine which he judged or considered in accordance with the Prophet (V. 15.) Therefore Peter presided over the Jerusalem Council.

Herod arrests James—(Acts 11. 1.)—yet the faithful made no extraordinary efforts to save him. Herod arrests Peter, (Acts 12. 2) and "Prayer was made without ceasing unto the Church of God for him." Peter, and the Angel of God came and rescued Peter. (Verses 6, 7, and 8.) Now if Peter and James were of equal importance, why did not the Angel rescue James as well as Peter? Therefore Armstrong's own arguments prove that Peter was visible head of the Apostles and visible Governor of Christ's Church.

Our second proposition is easily proved: Christ willed that this primacy or visible government should be perpetuated in his church to the end of the world. 1st. A supreme visible primate or Governor is necessary for the conservation of the Christian Church, as already proven in my first proposition. So long, therefore, as the Church lasts, so long there will be a visible primate over that Church. But the Christian Church is to last to the end of the world. (Matthew 28. 20; Luke 1. 32; Dan. 2. 44.) Therefore there will be a visible primate ruling the whole Christian Church, until the end of the world. 2. From the Holy Scripture it is evident that all the Apostles were to have lawful successors, (II Tim. 2. 2; Mark 15. 16; Math 28. 519.) Thus almost the last words that Christ said to His Disciples were: "Preach the Gospel to every creature." "Teach all nations." Now the Apostles had only a few years to live; yet there are many nations to-day in existence that were then unborn, and all these nations are to be "taught," and "preached to." Now, one of two things, either Christ commanded his apostles an impossible, which would be blasphemy to say, or else Christ willed that the Apostles were to have successors in the ministry, as well as "every creature" and "all nations" would last. But if all the other apostles were to have successors till the end of the world, then certainly Peter the chief of the Apostles must also have a successor in the person of some supreme visible Governor ruling the whole Christian Church.

Let us sum up: 1st. We have proved on philosophical grounds that a visible society cannot be conserved without a supreme visible Primate or Governor; 2dly. We have proved on theological grounds that the Church of Christ is a visible Society, consequently it must have a Supreme Visible Primate; 3dly. We have shown from Scripture that Christ appointed Peter Supreme Visible Primate over his entire Church; lastly, we have also shown from Scripture that this supreme visible primacy will last until the end of the world. Wherefore the only logical conclusion is, that there is, at the present day, a Supreme Visible Primate ruling the entire Christian Church. Who is this privileged person? There is only one whose authority is so great—it is Leo XIII, the present Pope of Rome. No other man on earth asserts his claim to that Primacy, because no other man on earth has any claim to it. Peter was the first Pope of Rome, as all the great writers of antiquity—including the learned Protestant divines, Blondel, Cave, Grotius, and even Calvin—tell us he was. In the 6th canon of the Council of Nice (A. D. 325) it is said: "The Roman See has

always held the Primacy." In a word, if Peter was not the first Pope of Rome, who was the first? Pope of Rome? Leo XIII is not Peter's lawful Successor, who is Peter's lawful successor? History gives us the names of the 257 Popes who have successively occupied St. Peter's Chair at Rome; each Pope came in his turn, and acted as visible Governor of Christ's Church. All these Popes form one grand pontifical chain, in which there is not a single broken link. All these Popes stand as it were, in a line with joined hands, while the Primacy—like an electric current—passes from Christ to Peter and from Peter to Linus, and all the others, down even to Leo XIII.

Therefore the Roman Catholic Church is the Church of Christ. In the true Church we have two elements—one visible and the other invisible, and these elements are called by analogy "the body" and "the soul" of the Church. (Rom. 12. 4; I Cor. 12. 13; Acts 4. 32.)

The soul of the Church consists in that supernatural influence (viz. 3.—Faith, Hope and Charity) whereby Christian-are vivified and united in order to reach the one spiritual end to which they are all destined. (Acts 4. 32.) We speak of the body of the Church in so far as it is a visible society.

Belongs all Roman Catholics, whether saints or sinners; if they die in sanctity they will be saved—if they die in mortal sin they will be lost. Who are they who belong to "the soul" of the Catholic Church? All Christians who are in a state of sanctifying grace, viz. The just who strictly follow the real dictates of conscience and firmly believe their own Church to be the True Church. All these really belong to "the soul" of the Roman Catholic Church, (who knows that Armstrong is included,) and if they die in that state they will be saved. I have said they must "firmly believe" because if they have any doubt that their Church is not the true Church of Christ then they are "without the way of salvation," because where there is doubt there is no faith, and without faith it is impossible to please God. (Heb. 11. 6.) If, therefore, any Christian doubts positively, whether his be the true Church or not, he is bound to remove his doubts, by seeking out the true church. —This is not merely my private opinion—it is the belief of two hundred and fifty millions of Roman Catholics.

Hence, Armstrong's objections are easily refuted: 1st. Boniface 8th believed the Roman Church to be identical with the true Church of Christ, and whatever he said of one he said of the other; so do L. Boniface (L'Annuaire Sacramentaire) say, that submission to the Roman Pontiff (that is to the representative of Christ on earth) is a matter of faith. I say the same thing. But did Boniface ever say that all Protestants would be lost? No, he never did; Armstrong's argument has no point—it is shot missed even the target. Here is his second objection: "Schismatics are without the way of salvation" (Delahogue.) Schismatics are they who merely reject the authority of the Roman Pontiff. If in doing this, they follow the real dictates of conscience, they are only natural schismatics, and may, possibly, be "without the way of salvation." If they follow the dictates of pride and rebellion they are formal Schismatics and are "without the way of salvation," because they are guilty of the sin of pride and disobedience. Now it is of this latter class that Delahogue speaks, as is evident from the context. At all events Delahogue never said that all Protestants are predestinated to be lost.

As a signal of distress Mr. Armstrong fires off the following home made "canon": "If the acknowledged head of himself to be under the Bishop of Rome (Pope) and that the Bishop of Rome is ordained by God to have primacy over all the world is a heretic and cannot be saved." T. Armstrong, Parkhill—no other authority given. He puts it in quotation marks, and asserts it without any proof that this proposition is a part of Catholic Canon Law; now in the very same breath he says that, "an assertion without proof is of no weight." Therefore his canon is of no weight. I find it nowhere among the authorized canons of the Church. It is a very suspicious looking canon. I wouldn't be surprised if this canon were manufactured to order; it has a home-made appearance. Perhaps it is charged with dynamite! I should think it dangerous for Mr. Armstrong to trifle with such a canon (or canon) as his, it might explode!

This canon proves nothing till it is shown to be by the Catholic Church. In the meantime I will spike this canon down as a souvenir of Armstrong's first signal of distress. (Here I may remark, by way of parenthesis, that I am a native of Canada, and unfortunately I am blessed with neither brogue nor blarney.) This is Armstrong's finale: "It is evident that the Rev. gentleman with his brogue and blarney, knew how to gain access to the pockets of those against whom his Church shuts Heaven's gate." No doubt it was an important discovery! We now, this is a very suspicious looking canon. I wouldn't be surprised if this canon were manufactured to order; it has a home-made appearance. Perhaps it is charged with dynamite! I should think it dangerous for Mr. Armstrong to trifle with such a canon (or canon) as his, it might explode!

This canon proves nothing till it is shown to be by the Catholic Church. In the meantime I will spike this canon down as a souvenir of Armstrong's first signal of distress. (Here I may remark, by way of parenthesis, that I am a native of Canada, and unfortunately I am blessed with neither brogue nor blarney.) This is Armstrong's finale: "It is evident that the Rev. gentleman with his brogue and blarney, knew how to gain access to the pockets of those against whom his Church shuts Heaven's gate." No doubt it was an important discovery! We now, this is a very suspicious looking canon. I wouldn't be surprised if this canon were manufactured to order; it has a home-made appearance. Perhaps it is charged with dynamite! I should think it dangerous for Mr. Armstrong to trifle with such a canon (or canon) as his, it might explode!

But enough! My opponent appears to have nothing to demand. His theological status (if he has any) is not defined, his religious tenets belong, no doubt, to the genus mongrel. Hence, in future, I will look upon Mr. Armstrong's moribund effusions of obsolete theology as utterly unworthy of notice.

ALBERT MCKEON, L. T. Parkhill, Jan. 16, 1881.

**FATHER MCKEON'S REPLY TO ARMSTRONG.**  
Continued from last week.

Therefore God conferred on Peter a nature and privileges corresponding to Peter's name. Now, what does Peter's name signify? The word "Peter" in all languages signifies "rock." In the Syriac language the word for "Peter" is "Chappa"; in Syrochaldaic (the language that Christ spoke) is "Kepha"; in Arabic, it is "Bischara"; in French it is "Pierre"; in every language "Peter" and "rock" have one and the same meaning.

But why did Christ give Peter the name "rock"? Because Christ—"a wise man"—intended to build His