

The Catholic Record.

"Christianus mini nomen est, Catholicus vero Cognomen." — "Christian is my Name, but Catholic my Surname."—St. Pacian, 4th Century.

VOLUME 9.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, JUNE 23, 1888.

NO. 505

N. WILSON & CO.

Have the FINEST GOODS in the trade for **SPRING SUITS & OVERCOATS.** Order from us and you will be pleased with fit and price. 112 Dundas Street, near Talbot.

Written for the Catholic Record. At Goderich.

'Twas evening when the noisy Mattland,
Fishing,
Mingles itself with Huron's mightier waves,
The glowing August sun in waters fishing,
A wondrous rare to lake and river gave.
A little church lay in the way before me
(How will in memory's light I see it still),
And led, as if a magic spell were o'er me,
I entered it as by another's will.
Within, the shades of twilight round me
gleaming,
Woke my heart a little trembling doubt,
Which, tripping, sought with timid, half-
shamed feeling,
Some reassurance from the world without.
Then passing on, with meaning as I un-
certain,
To where, in one far corner, paused the
light
(As if he lingered, loathing yet to enter)
The loving Lord, who said "There be
light."
I stood before The Christ, the long robe
flowing
Down to His feet seemed stirred—I saw it
more;
The eyes, with sympathy's soft light, were
glowing,
And the lips curved with eloquence of love.
To me it was no image of the Ideal—
That need outstretch, as if to clasp my
own,
The other on His heart—I knew I was real,
And "Jesus only" whom I looked upon.
So oft he waits till sunny days are over,
With wanderers in the dark to keep His
light,
And through His long, sweet springtime,
Patient, Loving,
In missing face, how much my heart has
missed!
But words are weak to paint that unsought
meeting,
The newborn longing near His still to
stay,
When from the hands, the eyes, the lips,
Whose greeting
All called me back, I slowly turned away.
I left the church; night's mantle dark was
falling—
Across the lake the sun no longer burned;
Impatiently my friend my name was call-
ing,
And homeward, in the silence, we return-
ed.

My Lady June.

She is here in all her glory,
With her favours falling free,
Singing still the same sweet story
She has always sung to me.
Oh! the roses blush to meet her,
Sneaking in their diamond dew,
And the stately lilies greet her,
As for her sake they have grown true.
How her voice, with joy o'erflowing,
Peaches Nature's own true tone,
Music only here bestowing,
She is here—my Lady June.
Memory near her gently pressing,
Leads her song one tender tone,
And one touch to her ear ringing,
For the hearts that she has known,
It may be some picture given,
Or some half-forgotten name,
For when Faith in youth had prayed,
But she guards even sorrow,
With a wreath that dies too soon;
It will never be the more—
She is here—my Lady June.
She would bear for me less gladness,
Less of loving light and joy,
If she gathered not the sadness
That made shadows on the way.
For I like to think she knows me,
And remembers, and is still,
When Life's own looks back and shows me
What its own life has meant to fill.
So she ever comes in free,
With her favours falling free,
Singing still the same sweet story
She has always sung to me.

—FRANCIS SMITH.

Special to the Catholic Record.
FROM ARTHUR.

ORDINATION OF REV. ANGELO M'INTOSH, OF ARTHUR.

The son of one of our most esteemed citizens, Rev. Angelo McIntosh, was ordained priest of the Catholic Church at Montreal by Archbishop Fabre on the 27th of May. The Rev. Father McIntosh is a native of Arthur village, being born there on the 19th of July, 1865, and having attended the separate school there for a period, and being highly regarded by the Rev. Father O'Leary, the respected parish priest of that village, he went to reside with him at Caledonia and attended the high school there for several terms after which he went to Ber-
lin College. He evinced such extra-ordinary talent that he finished a course, usually taking four or five years, in three years, carrying off most of the prizes in the institution. He then went to the Grand Seminary, Montreal, for four years, and from which he was ordained. His career has been distinguished by talent of an ordinary kind, the most valuable prizes for the classical and other languages at the institution falling to him. He is highly esteemed by all classes in Arthur. A grand future is predicted for him, and he has our warmest wishes for his prosperity. Mr. Duncan McIntosh has given two children to the Church, Isabella, now Sister Emerentia, located at Oskville, and the Rev. gentleman above mentioned.

OBITUARY.

Miss Addie Elizabeth O'Dwyer.
We regret to learn of the death of Miss Addie Elizabeth O'Dwyer, eldest daughter of Mr. Stephen O'Dwyer, of Watford. This young lady departed on the 3rd of June. She was most highly esteemed by all who knew her for her many admirable qualities. She was a sincere and pious Catholic. The funeral took place on Tuesday, 5th instant, from her father's residence to the Catholic cemetery. We offer our heartfelt condolence to her family in their great loss.

Written for the Catholic Record. HOW A SCHOOLMASTER BECAME A CATHOLIC.

LETTER XV.

It would be superfluous to point out what no one will deny, that for every society there must be a government. "No society," says Guizot, "can exist a week, not even an hour, without a government." And I think that the great bulk of professing Christians are perfectly agreed that the Kingdom, created offices and appointed officers. But, concerning the number and nature of these offices, there have been interminable discussions. The Presbyterians, comparatively few and quite modern, but sturdy sticklers for their own narrow sense of Scripture, hold up against the hierarchy composed of the three orders of the episcopate, the priesthood and the diaconate, the novel system that all the ministers of the Gospel were originally and should be, now equal; that the two words in the Testament, translated bishop and presbyter, are interchangeable names for the same commissioned teacher and ruler, and that a deacon stands no higher than a lay official, to be used for a few menial duties. To support their assertion, they draw their few shabby proofs exclusively from Scripture, innocently oblivious of the simple facts that the whole matter must have been settled before a word in the Testament was written, and that the Testament neither professes, nor can be reasonably expected to contain express and decided proofs of the question; they calmly ignore the earliest historical evidence that stands against them, and bare to view the inference that the Kingdom of Christ had been ignorant of its proper government, until they themselves sprung into existence in the sixteenth century! St. Ignatius, without doubt a disciple of St. John, and Bishop of Antioch, in his epistles, reiterates the command to obey the bishop, the presbyter, and the deacon. "And again, I cried, therefore, with the voice, being among you, and I spoke with a loud voice, with the voice of God—attend to the bishop, and the presbyters, and the deacons. And there are some who imagine respecting me, that I have said these things as though I knew the divisions of some—but He in whom I am bound is Witness to us that I have not learned these things from men; but the spirit cried and said these things; "Without the bishop do nothing" (Ep. to Phil. c. viii, Clement's Ig.). His epistles breathe with the names of the three orders. The Presbyterians can do nothing with these memorials but to pronounce them forgeries. Professor Calvin E. Stowe, whom any Presbyterian might take for a backer, says, in his Origin and History of the Books of the Bible: "These seven epistles (of St. Ignatius) have been known and read in the Christian Churches from the very earliest period. There is an edition of them of about the sixth century, which undoubtedly contains many interpolations; but the earlier and briefer recensions, of which Archbishop Usher had a Latin translation, and J. Voss the Greek original, may safely be received as genuine throughout." (p. 122). If Bishops and Presbyters were in all things identical, how is it that Eusebius has preserved catalogues of the successive Bishops of Rome, of Alexandria, of Antioch, of Jerusalem, etc.? Why, if all were equal, should a succession of individuals, from the very beginning of these churches, stand out so prominently? On no supposition, except of official superiority, can it be accounted for. I once read a Presbyterian effusion in which it was gravely asserted that episcopacy was invented by St. Cyprian! Guizot could hardly be expected to make a full episcopal declaration, but what he says is dead against the Presbyterian theory: "But the moment this society (Church) began to advance, and almost at its birth, for we find traces of them in its earliest documents, there gradually became moulded a form of doctrine, rules of discipline, a body of magistrates: of magistrates called presbyteroi, or elders, who afterwards became priests; of episcopoi, or bishops; and of diakonoi, or deacons, whose office was the care of the poor and the distribution of alms." (Civ. p. 37.) Mosheim also, and Gibbon, testify to the existence of the three orders, at the commencement of the second century. Palmer very rightly observes: "How it is possible indeed to suppose that such a pre-eminence could have prevailed universally in the second century without any objection, if it had not been instituted by the apostles? We know the disturbances which arose in the Church on the time of keeping Easter; how improbable is it, that episcopacy could have been introduced into all churches by merely human authority, without exciting opposition in some quarter." (Church, Vol. ii, p. 383). This will always stand against Presbyterianism, if Christ, or the Apostles, instituted Presbyterianism, which was so soon and so suddenly subverted, where can the history of the subversion be found? The ambitious would have struggled for the highest offices; the disappointed would have vented their mortification. It would have been one of the greatest disturbances connected with the history of the Church; and yet there is not a word about it in all the ancient records. The common sense inference would be, then, that Presbyterianism was born, to be known, in the sixteenth century, and that the Anglicans, Greeks and Catholics, who believe and teach the Apostolic institution of bishops, priests and deacons, are, in this respect, and so far, in full informed agreement.

But here the Anglicans rest themselves; they strangely insisted that in the Apostolic college every apostle was in all things equal to the others; that in jurisdiction all were equals. Accordingly, the Church seems to have been provided, for her highest grade of rulers, with an exalted body of Presbyters!

The catechism of Trent (p. 74) says: "The Church has also, but one ruler and one governor, the invisible one, Christ, whom the Eternal Father hath made head over all the Church, which is His body; the visible one, Him, who, as legitimate successor of Peter the prince of the apostles, fills the apostolic chair." Catholics teach that, to ensure the unity of the Church and her harmonious action, Christ clothed one of the Apostles with supreme authority, which authority was to be, and has been, exercised by his successor. In a general way, they observe that unity finds its complement in one and that the Church, a visible society, must have, for her perfect realization, a visible head. They say, too, that for a shepherd there must be a shepherd; and for a kingdom, a king. To this Mr. Palmer objects that "many States have subsisted without a monarchy." This is to forget that the Church is a kingdom; and the ruler of a kingdom, or a part of it, is always a king, or his vicary. They hold, besides that, since under the old law the authority of the High Priest was supreme over the Priests and the Levites and that the synagogue was the type (1 Cor. x. ii) of the Christian Church, the Church, if modelled after the Mosaic dispensation, cannot be without a visible ruler. And that the polity of the synagogue was transferred to the Church is pretty plain from "But this is not all; for the times of the offerings and services of Christians are referred to the authority of the Lord Himself, who commanded that they should not be made at random, or in a disorderly manner, but at fixed seasons and hours. It is impossible that this is only a transference of the laws of the Jewish synagogue, which was sanctioned by the observance of our Saviour, to the Christian Church; as is indeed made probable by the parallel which Clement (Romanus) institutes between the Levitical and Christian Priesthood (Westcott's Canon, p. 27). If, too, as Kurtz says, the Church is "a school in which men are divinely educated for salvation," it must, like every other educational institution, be directed and ruled by a single head.

But for the pre-eminence of one Apostle there are clear Scriptural proofs. Scripture may, or may not, make episcopacy plain; it makes nothing plainer than the primacy of St. Peter. However, the names of the Apostles are given, Peter "the first," has always a marked prominence. It has been accounted for on the supposition that he was the eldest of the Apostles, or that he was the first called. Both conjectures are most certainly at variance with facts. If the precedence of name be observed to designate the oldest, there was Andrew older than Peter, for we read (John 1, 41) "the city of Andrew and Peter"; and we are told in the same chapter that Andrew "first findeth his own brother Simon, and saith unto him, We have found the Messiah." "And he brought him to Jesus. And when Jesus beheld him, He said, Thou art Simon the son of Jonas; thou shalt be called Cephas, which is by interpretation, a stone." (John 1, 42.) Here, our Lord, for a reason not yet declared, so distinguished one that He promised him a new name by which he was henceforth to be known. It was no mere epithet, like the "Sons of Thunder," but a special appellation. And when He ordained the twelve, He formally conferred the name. "And Simon He surnamed Peter." (Mark 16, 16.) To Simon alone was a new name given. It had been usual with the Almighty, in ushering in a new dispensation, to confer upon its chief a new name, indicative of the office he was to fill; Abram became Abraham, and Jacob, Israel. Hence, Simon's new name, Peter, a Rock, must have pertained something important. Portended! Its significance is all but open and declared. Simon received a name that belonged to Christ Himself. Christ Himself was the Rock, and, as if to adopt Simon completely and to qualify him for His own representative, He gave him His own name.

But Jesus made everything plain (Matt. XVI 19) by publicly divesting the reason why he had called Peter "The Rock." When He asked His Apostles, "Whom say ye that I am?" Peter answered, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." For this prompt confession, Jesus said to him, "Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father who is in heaven." With Peter's reply Jesus was evidently well pleased; and what was more natural than a great and special instance of rewarding such a confession. Jesus said: "I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto 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." This is as the Protestant Testament gives it, and even as it stands, it ought to be plain enough. Some of those exegetes that have broken their way so triumphantly through most of the prophecies read it thus: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock (Myself) I will build my Church." But such a reading makes Jesus use the mixed metaphor. He would not in the same breath call Himself both builder and foundation. But the text can be put into a form so sharp that it will defy all carpentering. The language used by Christ was the Syro-Chaldaic, the vernacular at that time of Judea. He said: "Thou art Kapha, and on this Kapha I will build my Church." How is this gained? Some thrust it aside by denying that Syro-Chaldaic was the language used. If, as it seems, this is their only chance to evade it, they are in a bad dilemma. The Methodist Beason, in Introduction to St. Matthew's Gospel, says: "But (the language) was what Jerome properly calls Syro-Chaldaic, having an affinity to both the Syrian and Chaldean language, though much more to

the latter than the former." Westcott says: "There can be no doubt that the so-called Syro-Chaldaic (Aramesh) was the vernacular language of the Jews of Palestine in the time of our Lord, however much it may have been superseded by Greek in the common business of life. It was in this dialect, the 'Hebrew' of the New Testament, that the Gospel of St. Matthew was originally written" (Canon, p. 239). "It is used in Syro-Chaldaic, the language in which it was spoken by Jesus Christ, (Matt. xxi. 17). Peter was called Cephas, and the word Cepha signifies base, foundation, rock." (Guizot's Note on Gibbon, Vol. I, p. 561). Hence, by saying, "Thou art Kapha, and on this Kapha I will build my Church," our Lord, beyond all dispute, made St. Peter the Foundation of the Church. No declaration in the Testament is more emphatic. How He would build it, He did not say; it would be "known hereafter." But He declared that against the Church so built the gates of hell should not prevail. It was to withstand all future assaults. The God-Man gave His word for it. Is it purely "Papistical" to say that the Church was built on St. Peter? Hear the Protestant Pearson: "Then was there a Church (and that built upon Peter, according to our Saviour's promise)" (Cred. p. 511). Bishop Kenrick on the Primacy cites several eminent Protestants who have made the same flat admission: To St. Peter were also given the keys, and the commission to bind and to loose; and although the power "to bind and to loose" was afterwards given to the other apostles, there was surely some deep import in the fact that it was first given to him who was to be the only bearer of the keys. The keys were given to St. Peter alone, to him who was alone the foundation of the Church. The holder of the keys must have a pre-eminence power of binding and loosing, of office conferred upon him! As in the Church the duties of binding and loosing must always exist, so long must exist the bearer of the keys, St. Peter; and as no superstructure can outlast its foundation, so the Church must always rest on Peter. Peter, then, always lives in his successor. Was Christ a true Prophet? The question obtrudes itself. Was Christ a true Prophet, or not? If He was, there must to day be a Church that claims St. Peter for her foundation, and the wielder of her Keys must be St. Peter's successor. Unless these things be, the Testament is no better than a romance. Moreover, that St. Peter was the representative of the collective Apostolate is quite manifest from (Luke xxii, 31): "Simon, Satan hath desired to have you (vos), that he may sift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee (pro te) that thy strength fail not, and when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." A prayer offered for St. Peter sufficed for all; on his steadfastness all the others depended. He was the foundation of the Church in the last chapter of St. John's Gospel we can read that Jesus committed to the care of St. Peter the lambs and the sheep—the laity and the clergy—and was strictly charged to "feed" all. The whole sheepfold was put under his rule and care. So St. Peter "the first," was made the foundation of the Church; he was the only recipient of the keys; he him alone Jesus prayed; and to his guardianship Jesus entrusted His entire flock. And yet there are some men, scholars and believers by profession, who can see nothing in all this but a little personal honor, or of consequence whatever, that was shown to St. Peter. Mr. Palmer, when arguing against the Presbyterians, very well says: "Indeed officers chiefly honorary, would have been inconsistent with the characters and views of Christians in those times." (Vol. ii, p. 391). On page 479, Vol. ii, he has taken from Catholic tradition, "the reasons for which St. Peter had a personal pre-eminence of honor among the Apostles." So must a principle be forgotten, and blindness be confessed, to distort the palpable truth.

Translated for the Record from the *Revue Canadienne*.
A PAGE OF OUR HISTORY.
The Jesuits in Canada Under English Rule.
CONTINUED.
V. RESULTS OF THE BRIEF OF CLEMENT XIV. IN CANADA.
Monsieur Briand had done his best to avert the blow. In a letter addressed to the sisters in law of the late Mgr. de Pombriand at Rennes, he says: "I wrote to our Holy Father, in accordance with your suggestions; my letter remained in London for more than a year, and only reached His Holiness after the ruin was accomplished; alas! a poor insignificant bishop like myself could do nothing to retard it."
Here is, as he relates in the same letter, the effect of the reception of the Brief: "You know, long before I did, the sad catastrophe of the Jesuits; it sifted me and tries my faith. How much it cost me to tell these good Fathers that I had the Brief and the command to impart it to them! Their prompt submission, their entire docility, did not lessen my grief, but, on the contrary, rendered it the more poignant. Relief has come from a quarter where I did not hope for it, from the Governor, Protestant although he is."
"So that our Jesuits still have the dress, and the name of Jesuits, and perform the functions of Jesuits, and none in Canada but the Governor, I and my Secretary, know that they are no longer Jesuits—themselves excepted."
"I send to the Sovereign Pontiff an account of my action, and I have had the boldness to ask of him the indulgences which may be gained in their houses, in the meantime subject to my orders and direction, telling him that I have established the same superior and procurator in response to his commands and have left them the same external surroundings in accordance with the views of the governor."
The letter of Mgr. Briand (6 Nov. 1774) to Cardinal Castelli, gives the same facts in similar words:
"The former Jesuits have submitted with all possible docility to the Brief of His Holiness which destroys their institutes; they have acknowledged their privileges to be extinct and have placed themselves entirely at my disposition. The Governor wishes that no exterior change be made, which is the reason of my having named the same superior and procurator who manage the property under my orders."
"This appeared to me to be the only way of making the commands of His Holiness accord with the governor's views."
Finally, in a letter of the 26th September, 1776, addressed to the ladies mentioned above, he says:
"I have reported my action in this matter to the Sovereign Pontiff and have received a Brief of approbation and a continuation of all the indulgences."
Is it not evident from all this, that, not only canonically, but civilly as well, up to the time of the Brief of Suppression, the Jesuits of Canada had retained their rights, their privileges and their property?

IN MEMORY OF ARCHBISHOP LYNCH.

Boston Pilot.
The Dublin Freeman pays this grateful tribute to the memory of the patriot Archbishop of Toronto, whose death is deeply regretted in Ireland:
"The people of Ireland will affectionately remember him as a friend who, though very distant from them, was never forgetful of them, or of anything that concerned them. His love for the Old Land was as fresh and strong on the morning of his death as it was nearly fifty years ago, when he left its shores, a young priest of the community of St. Vincent de Paul, to minister to the spiritual needs of his exiled fellow countrymen away in far off Canada. At critical periods in their recent struggles the words of Archbishop Lynch often came to our people to cheer them and to encourage them in their deponency, and to bid them be hopeful of the nearness of a great future, which he was convinced, they had before them. Possibly, had he lived, he would have spoken to them once again in this final episode of their long and weary struggle, and pointed to the signs that presage and precede the triumph. He loved Ireland with all his heart while he lived, and we may be assured that in death he will not forget her, as we feel assured that Ireland will not forget him, or the flock in whose sorrow for his loss her people so sincerely share."
Our Montreal agent will call on subscribers in St. Henri, Cote St. Paul, and Lacolle in the course of the week. We hope, our friends in those places will kindly assist in promoting the interests of the Catholic Record.

tion that this recognition should not be in any way prejudicial to the rights of the crown . . . and we think that neither one nor other of these acts can be considered as acts of approbation and confirmation. On the contrary, the gentleness and forbearance which have been shown, ought to work the other way, and move the Jesuits to a sense of gratitude to His Majesty for the protection which they have received, and to a prompt acquiescence in his desires." (2)

(3) These gentlemen evidently pretend that all this property devolved upon the crown by right of conquest. These Enclaves! Indeed the Jesuits must see, grateful to them.

TO BE CONTINUED.
LATEST PHASES OF THE IRISH QUESTION.
The officials of Dublin Castle are puzzled to know how the Nationalists succeed in discovering their confidential instructions to the police and other secret documents, and it is intended to inflict severe penalties on those who make the disclosures; for which purpose it is proposed to pass an Act which will authorize the Government to do this. But as the persons making the disclosures have never been discovered, it does not appear likely that the Act will be much of a deterrent.

United Ireland says: Once again the Castle authorities have been kind enough to furnish us with an advance copy of a strictly private and confidential circular which has been addressed to every Revenueable in Ireland. The circular is in cipher, but as we had some time since provided ourselves with a key, we experienced no serious difficulty on that account: "If John Dillon, M. P., is observed in your division, he is to be carefully shadowed, and his movements watched and reported. Every effort is to be made to have notes taken of all speeches delivered by him or by William O'Brien." INSPECTOR GENERAL, R. I. C.

It is stated that the proclamation of Dublin under the Coercion Act has for its object the suppression of *United Ireland*. That journal says that if Mr. Balfour should pay a visit to the office, he will be received as he deserves.

The National League, Mr. Balfour's "thing of the past," is on the alert in South Tyrone. A meeting was held toward the end of the month of May to take action for the proper registration of voters in view of the next election, when Mr. Wm. O'Brien will contest the seat with Mr. Russell. Notwithstanding Mr. Russell's vote on King-Harman's salary Bill, the Nationalists will not trust him. One hundred delegates were at the Convention.

As a detachment of the Wiltshire Regiment was leaving Boyle (Colonel King-Harman's town) on the 20th inst., one of them called for "vires cheers for Farnell," which was responded to enthusiastically by his comrades. The country people, who were in town in large numbers, it being market day, joined in the cheers, and escorted the troops to the railway station, cheering loudly for Gladstone and Parnell, and groaning the names of Balfour and King-Harman.

In the House of Commons on the 11th, Mr. Balfour, in replying to Mr. Gladstone, declined to put on the table the evidence on which convictions for boycotting had been obtained, and said that the ends of justice were amply secured through the superior court, while the evils of boycotting would be seriously aggravated by publicity.

Mr. Herbert Gladstone, M. P., in a recent speech, said the outlook for the Liberal party was extremely bright. Coercion should not last, and the question of local government for Ireland must soon be decided with. If the government came to grief over it in the House of Commons so much the better. If they did not, and passed their bill giving power in local affairs to the people of Ireland, the victory was with them, for then the lever would be obtained for getting home rule.

The *Dublin Express*, Independent Conservative, says that "Col. King-Harman's death relieves the Government of the cowardly disgrace of throwing him over." It is rumored that Mr. Robert W. Fitzgerald, M. P. for Cambridge, will be his successor in the under-secretaryship.

The Dublin corporation will present an address of welcome to Archbishop Walsh when he returns to that city.

The Mayor of Cork visited the male prison on Thursday and saw Mr. Gordon, M. P., who complained that he could not sleep on the plank bed as it was too short and too narrow; he lay upon the floor and slept well. His Worship visited some other prisoners also committed for breaches of the Crimes Act, but they made no complaints, or if they did the Mayor does not give them publicity.

Another great Liberal victory has been gained in Ayr. Considering that at the previous election Mr. Campbell, a Liberal Unionist, was elected by a majority of 1175, it was hardly to be expected that a Liberal would win now. However, Captain Sinclair-Gladstone, has carried the constituency by a majority of sixty three. He received 2331 votes against 2268 cast for his opponent, Mr. Evelyn Anley, Liberal Unionist. At the previous election the vote stood—Campbell, 2673; Sinclair, 1498. The result yesterday shows a Gladstonian gain of 1238 votes. The Liberals are jubilant over the unexpected result of the election, and claim that it is direct proof of the veering of public opinion to their support. The contest was fought upon strict Home Rule lines. Late in the day the workmen went to the polls in large numbers, and almost without exception voted for the Liberal candidate. This was the turning point of the contest, the Tories having had in the earlier part of the day very much the best of the voting and bright prospects of victory.

VI. CIVIL STANDING OF THE SOCIETY OF JESUS IN CANADA FROM THE BRIEF OF CLEMENT XIV. UP TO THE DEATH OF FATHER CASOL.
The English Government have the present royal ordinances carried out.

Not at all, and with scarcely any exception, all their property as well as the titles thereof, and the civil rights appertaining, remained in the Fathers' possession up to the death of the last one of them.

What we have said upon the subject of Amherst's claims proves it sufficiently. We will, however, add some further proofs.

When in 1759 (17th June) the minority of the Commission (out of nine) surreptitiously made their report, which concluded by declaring the king to be proprietor and even possessor of the property of the Jesuits, Alexander Gray and Jenkin Williams, crown law officers in Canada, improved again upon this report, 15th May, 1790, showing themselves to be as partial as possible. (Ribaud p. 338.)

In order to demolish the argument of the committee of the Legislative Council, cited above, they said:
"The principles upon which the honorable members of the Committee of the Council have adopted this opinion, namely, the possession of the Jesuits with the sanction, and under the very eyes of the Crown and all the various acts of incorporation, not to say, confirmation on the part of the ministers, have no weight in our eyes; because the government to our knowledge has done nothing, and allowed nothing to be done, to alter or change the standing of the Jesuits at the time of the conquest, nor since." (1)