

the making and unmaking of parties." It has argued that this is proof enough that Catholics are corrupt. How comes it now that it recommends the Equal Rights party, the party of purity and righteousness, to adopt this corrupt policy? Has the Mail become a convert to the awful doctrine that "the end justifies the means"? Or is this "honest and independent" leader of righteous Protestantism merely a Jesuit in disguise?

EXIT FULTON.

Filthy Fulton has come and gone, and it may be permitted us to ask what good has he done. His presence of the beastly villifier of everything pure and good contributed in any way towards the moral improvement of the city of London? Have the obscene expressions and the filthy allusions which go to make up the sum total of Fulton's abominable lectures conferred any benefit on the readers, young and old, of the daily journals, on which they were printed almost verbatim? We trow not. We are strongly of opinion that these impure lectures of Fulton have wrought great harm, if not have, among a certain class of readers whose imagination is easily excited, and who are apt to say to themselves, if clergymen be so vile as Fulton represents them, what morality may be expected from us? Why should we be virtuous when they are so vicious? It is utterly impossible, therefore, that such lectures should not be followed by the very worst results. It was the duty of the civil authorities to put a stop to the publication of such poisonous literature. The law is very strict in this matter, and why has it not been put in force? Obscene literature may be seized upon at the frontiers or in Her Majesty's Custom Houses, and burnt or publicly destroyed, but any, even the least of Her Majesty's subjects, should in any way be harmed or the minds of their children be polluted and public morality be endangered. There is no doubt whatever about the existence of laws established for the preservation of good morals in this as in every other well-governed country in Christendom. Corrupting literature, impure works and pictures, may be arrested at the frontier and confiscated, while traffickers in such villainous and soul destroying goods are liable to heavy fines and imprisonment. It is difficult to understand how men of Fulton's stamp are allowed to enter Canada unchallenged. But yet more inconceivable is the fact of his being allowed to peddle an immoral work of the most purulent character, that is full of horrible lies and of the vilest calumnies against Catholic priests, who are naturally under the protection of the civil government. The priests of any country are the best guardians of its morality. No civilization may last long, no Government may be said to have any guarantee of stability without morals—without respect for all the principles of public decency and of domestic as well as national honor. But where all these are thrown aside—where the very priests themselves are represented and falsely and lyingly held up as the most flagrant violators of all laws of decency and morality—it is almost time the authorities of the country should step in and enforce the laws that provide for individual protection and for public decency. Why should a lecherous foreigner be allowed to invade the sanctity of our Canadian homes, and with pestilential breath and impure lips and lascivious atitudes pollute the very air we breathe, and shock the delicate sense of our pure-minded Canadian women that for innate modesty and sterling virtue stand above reproach, and we venture to say, peerless on the continent of America? If the soul-polluting refiner is permitted the liberty of the unoffending subject—if he be allowed by our supine legislators and weak-kneed law officers to go about sowing the poison of immorality and of obscenity in every town and city—at least let them enforce the law against obscene literature, and seize upon Fulton's book of filth before too much evil is wrought and too many innocent souls are destroyed by the pestiferous and malignant influence of his blighting pages.

In the published accounts of Tuesday night's lecture it is said that Rev. Dr. Fulton explained how his filthy book came to be written. He did not tell his audience how all the young women in the printing establishment at Boston refused to work, how they would not pollute their hands or their eyes or their imaginations with the printing or the compilation of such a devilish book. He did not tell his audience how all those girls in Boston struck work and went home in a body and remained idle for a whole week rather than soil their fingers with such immoral dirt.

It is noteworthy that women, young and old, who are usually excluded from halls or courthouses on such occasions, were encouraged, on the contrary, to come and hear all the suggestive immoralities that would flow from the impure lips of the malodorous Fulton. It is noteworthy that Rev. J. A. Murray "commended the courage of the women, young and old, who were brave enough to be present at this meeting. It certainly must have required a triple

coat of brass, a truce to all shame, for any woman, old or young, to be found present at such a gathering. But what species of morality is that taught in the church of Rev. J. A. Murray when he encourages the young women of his congregation to attend lectures on impurity? What is to become of social life? What is to become of public decency? Where is it all going to end?

Fulton's lies might have gained credit as Maria Monk's did about fifty years ago. But the times have changed—people are not quite so gullible now as they were in those days.

THE ENGLISH MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS.

The liberal triumph at the late Municipal elections in England was even greater than was reported by cable. The Gladstonians have won from the enemy 122 boroughs, whereas the Tories have only captured 62, but as the Liberal-Unionists gained 3 and the Independents 3 from the Liberals, the whole Tory gain may be counted at 65 or 66. This makes the net gain of the Gladstonians 55. This, added to the gain of last year, would indicate a change of sentiment, in at least 120 boroughs, in favor of Mr. Gladstone, which would give him a majority of about 120 in Parliament if the electors adhere to their preferences in the coming Parliamentary election, even though Ireland and Scotland were to remain stationary, which is not likely to be the case.

A most noteworthy feature of the event is the demoralization and rout of the Unionist combination in Birmingham. The Liberals have gained four seats in that city, the home and stronghold of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain. This has been the result of the quarrel between the two wings of the party, and both have suffered equally, two Conservatives and two Liberal-Unionists having lost their seats, and a Conservative Liberal-Unionist majority of 1823 in the four wards in 1888 having been turned into a Liberal majority of 2,007 in 1889. Hundreds of Conservatives voted for the Liberal candidates in preference to the Liberal-Unionists, while the Liberal-Unionists retaliated by voting against the Conservatives in the other wards. One of the two Liberal-Unionists defeated was Mr. Austin Chamberlain, the son of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, and this makes the defeat more galling. As might be expected, the supporters of the Government are much demoralized by the general results, as it is a sure indication of total defeat at the general election. It is true that Municipal elections do not always depend upon the same issues which are at stake in Parliamentary contests, but it is equally true in England, as in Canada, that party preferences influence the electors in their choice, and that for the most part people work with the same allies in one election as in another. We may therefore take it for certain that the next Parliamentary contest will result in a great victory for Mr. Gladstone and Home Rule for Ireland.

The bye-elections alone were sufficient to prove that a great reaction has set in with the people of England, inclining them more than ever to grant the demands of Ireland, but the result of the Municipal elections, pointing in the same direction, makes assurance doubly sure.

ST. THOMAS OF AQUIN.

A brilliant writer of our own time has laid down for us in the following passage the characteristics of a noble writer:—"He should be a man with a purpose—a man who has a mission to say or sing to us noble things that have hitherto remained unsaid or that have been only partly uttered till he grasps their whole meaning and gives them their full rounded expression."

A thought such as this must have urged the Pope to bring again the works of St. Thomas prominently before the world. Moreover, he could not but be alarmed at the progress of unbelief. It is no longer propagated, as in 1789, by fire and sword, but quietly and surely, through books and periodicals, it is corroding the very base and superstructure of society.

To stem the ever-prevailing tide of infidelity Leo XIII. deemed it necessary to call the attention of mankind to the doctrine of St. Thomas. In his Encyclical on Christian Philosophy he thus speaks of St. Thomas' eminence as a scholar and teacher:—"Among the doctors of the schools St. Thomas stands forth by far the first and the master of all (as Cajetan has remarked); because he had a sovereign veneration for all the ancient doctors, he seems to have united in himself the intellectual powers of them all. Their teachings, which were like the scattered members of the same body, he put together and completed, arranging them in a marvellous order, and giving them such wonderful increase that he is justly held to be the great defender and glory of the Catholic Church."

After these words of the saintly predecessor of the Vatican little need is there to extol the "Angel of the Schools." Years have passed away since the grand Dominican, with all the force of his in-

flexible logic and analytical strength, built up the storehouse of Catholic theology, but his works, like a magic lyre, still thrill with unforgotten music.

Theories have vainly tried to supplant him in the schools. Spinoza, with his fantastic pantheism; Descartes, with his fundamental principle that the starting point of all truth must be our own consciousness; have passed away, and the system of St. Thomas is, as always, the gathering point of all who buckle on the armor of truth to do battle for the dearest interests of humanity.

He is the greatest philosopher of Christianity. St. Paul, guided by the Holy Ghost, determined its limits. St. Augustine adorned it with all the charms of his genius. St. Thomas indicated to mankind the reason of its solidity. His doctrinal works are, therefore, an arsenal from which weapons may be extracted to combat successfully the hydra-headed monster of infidelity. His articles, which Popes have crowned with the title of "Miracles," are so many gems that will shine forever on the coronet of human reason. We do not mean reason swayed by passion, perverted by prejudice, or corrupted by a Godless education. We mean reason keeping within its own legitimate precincts and which, nourished by the teachings of the true Church, aids us to understand that there are truths which, till the light of glory illumine our intellect, will forever defy our comprehension. This is the principle that underlies the Thomistic doctrine, and which prompted our venerable Pope to encourage mankind to drink deep of the sacred fount that wells from the intellect of him who wished no other glory but that of "Christ Crucified."

The words of Leo XIII. have awakened the greatest enthusiasm in Catholic circles, and already St. Thomas has become the preiding master in many a Catholic University.

The infidel world has perceived what a potent champion Catholicism possesses in the person of him who years ago drew thousands from all climes to the University of Paris, and hence many a violent tirade and calumnious denunciation have been issued by a press, whose hatred cynicism incites it to scorn a religion that aims but to purify and elevate mankind. Its enlightened judgment and historical knowledge will not allow it to be guided by a monk, especially a Dominican, whose very memory calls up a smell of fire and fog, and who, no doubt, carried around with him inquisitorial racks and pincers.

To mankind of this ilk, St. Thomas is scarcely offered, for it avails not to cast pearls before swine. The men, however, who, perplexed by the many jarring systems around them, and dismayed by the prettlers that are enveloped by infidel philosophy in a worse than Chimerian darkness, anxiously cry out, as Goethe, on the brink of eternity: more light! more light! will find in the works of the angelic doctor the solution of all their difficulties. The mysteries of the spiritual and material world, the prerogatives of human reason, the vexed questions of society, resolve in the doctrine of St. Thomas as full an explanation as philosophy, strengthened by Heaven's science, theology, can give us in this world.

FRANC TIERCE.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE BIBLE.

FATHER EGAN IN ANSWER TO REV. MR. PERCIVAL AND OTHERS WHO MAINTAIN THAT THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IS THE ENEMY OF THE BIBLE.

To the Editor of the Richmond Hill Liberal:—What is the Bible? The Bible is not one book, but a number of books, written not by one man, but by different men at various times and for various purposes. The various books composed by various men, at various times, and for various purposes, were collected into a volume, and that volume is called the Bible. The Bible is divided into the Old and New Testament. The Old Testament contains Revelations of God to man from the creation of man to the coming of Christ. The New Testament records Revelations of God to man made through Christ and the Apostles. The Old Testament is made up of twenty-one historical books, which are: the five books of Moses, the book of Joshua, the book of Judges, the book of Ruth, the four books of Kings, the two books of Chronicles, the book of Ezra, the book of Nehemiah, the book of Esther, the two books of Maccabees, seven didactic books, namely: Job, the Psalms, the sayings of Solomon, the Preacher, the Canticle of Canticles, Wisdom and Sirach; and sixteen prophetic books, that is, the four great prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Daniel, and the twelve lesser prophets. The New Testament contains six historical books, the four gospels and the Acts of the Apostles; as didactic books, fourteen Epistles of St. Paul, one of St. James, two of St. Peter, three of St. John, and one of St. Jude; and as prophetic, the Apocalypse. Having thus obtained a knowledge of what the Bible is, let us enquire how we came into the possession of the Bible. The Catholic Church is the only organic society that can trace history to its origin to Christ and the Apostles. It received the Old Testament from the Jewish Church. The New Testament was the work of its own teachers, who wrote these books and left them to this Church. The Gospels were written principally to satisfy the wishes of many who desired to be informed of the facts of Christ's life, to impress His teachings on

their minds, to perpetuate His words; and to oppose the wild theories of false and dissatisfied men. The Acts were written to record the work of the Apostles after the ascension of Christ, and especially missionary labors of St. Paul. The Epistles were letters addressed to those who had been converted to Christianity, and for the purpose of strengthening them in their faith and in the performance of their duties. As the art of printing did not exist when these books were written, they had for the purpose of circulation to be copied by hand. While copies of writings that came from the Apostles were thus circulated, other works pretending to come from Apostles, or from authors with apostolic authority, were circulated also. Thus we have these of Tatian, that of St. Luke used by Marcion, the ten false Epistles of St. Paul, etc. Besides, even in the copying of the genuine writings of the Apostles and Evangelists, numberless errors crept in from want of diligence, of accuracy, and difference of opinion with regard to words, their position and punctuation. Add to this the various translations that were made and the consequent liability of increasing the errors already existing in the various copies or copies of originals or exemplars, and we shall not be astonished when we hear St. Jerome, who, in the fourth century, at the request of Pope Damasus, set about the translation of the Old Testament and the revision of the New, exclaim, "Tui sunt exemplaria et codices." There are as many originals as copies.

Now, under such circumstances, and in such a state of affairs, what would have become of the Bible had not the Catholic Church taken the matter in hand and settled once for all the Canon, as it is called, of the sacred scriptures, and established for all time to come the genuineness of the Bible. This immortal work was done in the Council of Carthage in the year 397, and again affirmed by Pope Innocent I. in his letter to Exuperius the Bishop of Toulouse, and by Pope Gelasius in the first Council of Rome in 494. If we have a Bible at all, know now what is an inspired book and what is not, we owe it to the Catholic Church, to that Church whose councils and Popes definitively settled the matter a thousand years before Protestantism was born. Yet there are men who will tell you that the Catholic Church is the bitter enemy of the Bible. The Catholic Church, who saved the sacred books from destruction, Christians in China must be either governed by delusion or guilty of fraud. Sir James Brooke, addressing the society for the propagation of the Gospel, said to the members: "You have made a great deal at all either with the Huddoo or the Mahometan; you are just where you were the first day you went to India." Dr. Lurg, in 1852, said of these Protestant missionary efforts: "There is not a well-authenticated case of the conversion of a black native (of Australia) to Christianity." Major Danks reported to the House of Commons saying: "The missionaries have hardly Christianized a single individual in South Africa." Lord Castlereagh, speaking of Syria says: "The (protestant) bishop has scarcely a congregation besides his chaplains, his doctor and their families." I might go on quoting much more of this Protestant testimony to show that the method adopted by Protestants of converting the heathen by the free distribution of Bibles has resulted in complete failure. What is the obvious conclusion to which we must arrive from these potent facts? That the Bible is not the ordinary means designed by Providence to bring men to the knowledge of Christ's doctrine or Christ's law. Not only is it not the ordinary means, but it could not be. Millions could not use it. Children and the unlettered could not read it. Yet children went to be saved, we are not aware that the art of reading has ever been made a condition of salvation.

Nowhere has God ever made the reading of the bible obligatory upon anybody. Neither Moses, nor any of the Prophets, nor the Synagogue, nor Christ, nor the Apostles have ever promulgated a law to that effect. The reading of the Bible is not even a general means for the promotion of truth and godliness. The ordinary man who reads the Bible interprets any obscure passage he may chance to meet according to what he has already learnt from verbal teaching or he consults others wiser than himself, or he passes the passage by without further notice. If the third he gains nothing by reading the Bible. If the second he has only human authority for the guide. If the first he is no wiser than he was before he read. At the time of the Reformation everybody read the Bible and everybody outside the Catholic Church claimed the right to read and interpret it in accordance with his own private judgment just as Protestants do to-day. Did this universal Bible reading make the people better, more obedient, more chaste, more godly? Here is the answer given to us by history. From 1527 to 1529 the Duke of Saxony at the instigation of Martin Luther appointed a committee to visit the Danubian and report on the religious condition of those who had taken advantage of the reformed religion. The commission reported:—"In the district of Wittenberg 540 Protestant parishes and only 21 schools.—In Meissen Voigtland 87 parishes, embracing 238 towns and villages with 96 parishes and only 1 school. In Thuringia 187 parishes and only 9 schools.—Thus had one part of the time his services in regard to the Bible and his income amounted to 2 dollars a year. The person at Meissen was a journey man baker, the person at Salsenrode was a turner by trade and did not know the ten commandments. Parsons were found living with women to whom they were not married. The person at Laka had three wives living. In Holzdorf and Dabro the commissioners reported the people so bad that they ought to be driven out of the country by the hangman. In Schönbach and Colpin the peasants refused to go to church at all. In Werba the peasants could not say the Lord's Prayer. In Dabon only three persons went to church. The people of Saplitz and Mukrehna converted the church into a storage place for spring beer. In Globitz they passed beer jugs round and drank beer during divine service. Indeed, so bad was the state of affairs that Luther wrote: "Since the teaching of the new gospel everybody can see that the people are more availed, more merciful, more impure, more

impertinent and worse than they ever were under Popery." Such was the report of the commission and such the judgment of Luther himself. This does not look as if the reading of the Bible made people better. It is hard indeed to see how it could. Has it not been the shield behind which ever heresy has sought shelter? Luther found in the Bible the perniciousness of good works, the uselessness of the Sabbath as a special day of worship, the feasibility of bigamy, the sinlessness of adultery and many more moral enormities, which he defended and upheld with fearless brow. Calvin, John Knox and the Presbyterians found the enemy of the Bible! Think of it, ye inhabitants of Thornhill and Richmond Hill! The man that saved the ship with his priceless cargo from shipwreck, and brings that ship safely into port, is the enemy of the ship. So decides, with the Council of Carthage to the time of the so-called Reformation? Who multiplied Bibles, and watched that no errors crept into copies and translations during that long period of time? Who but the Catholic Church? It was her "1427" monks and nuns who, in the Scripturism of their Monasteries, labored for days and weeks and months and years even in copying and translating the books of the Old and New Testaments, who vied with one another in trading with deft hands the sacred words of inspiration on sheets of snowy vellum, and who produced the masterpieces of illuminated writing that still form the pride and the choicest treasures of the great libraries of Europe? Who was it that plotted the first Bible that ever came from the press? It was a Catholic. Who, when the rapid press turned out Bibles in abundance with imminent danger of error, established a censorship to obviate the difficulty and preserve the text in its purity? Again it was the Catholic Church. We are told that the Catholic Church is afraid of the Bible, dreads it. Funny is it not that a Church that so fears and dreads the Bible should go to such lengths to preserve it, to multiply it, to translate it correctly, to watch with sleepless eye over every one of its words, its sentences, even its commas, colons, semicolons and periods? It is funny, indeed. And that Catholic Church so astute, so cunning, so crafty, so full of guile and so full of guile, who fear wild beasts and kill them. We fear serpents and crush them. We do not hug them to our bosoms, and cherish them as we would a pet. Why does not the Catholic Church, instead of jealousy guarding the Bible, tear it to pieces, scatter its fragments to the winds, and, once for all, free herself from the fatal dread which that terrible Bible is said to inspire her with? Oh it is funny indeed?

But does not the Catholic Church forbid her children to read the Bible? Do you mean by the Bible any of the many versions of the Bible? If you are a mother and some one offers your child a package of poisoned candies you, no doubt, will allow your child to accept and eat those candies, though you know they are poisoned and your child does not; or you will probably permit your child to experiment on those candies and find out for itself whether they are poisoned or not. Oh, no! As a mother you love your darling and you will snatch the poisoned candies from his grasp, and forbid your little boy or girl to even touch the sweet temptation. Now what have we to say about the Protestant Bible? Many versions of the Bible have been issued forth since Martin Luther opened the Reformation ball at Wittenberg. Whole books and parts of books have been expunged—texts have been changed—words have been interpolated—punctuation marks removed and added so as to change the sense. Martin Luther wrote abroad. Dr. Easer, in the 16th century, found in the Bible of Luther one thousand and four hundred mistakes, and proved that three hundred of these errors were falsifications. Broughton tells us that the translation of the Bible into English is so defective that the texts of the Old Testament is falsified in eight hundred and forty places. Tindsh, Coverdale, and Queen Elizabeth's bishops favored the world with translations of the Bible, and these were so notoriously corrupt that an outcry was raised against them, which caused James I. to order a new version to be made. That version again was rejected, or altered, and after the Restoration the books that had been rejected were restored. Luther and the Reformers all had a special knack of making the Bible say what they wanted it to say, and for that purpose they threw out whole books. They threw out the Epistle of St. James because it taught the necessity of good works. They threw out Maccabees because it taught the wholesomeness of praying for the dead that their sins may be pardoned. They falsified texts, and when called to account for these outrageous proceedings their answer was: "Sic volo, sic jubeo, sit pro ratione voluntas." So I will it, so I order; let my will stand for reason.

After this do you ask why the Catholic Church forbids her children to use the Protestant Bible? Is a Bible that has been thus treated still the word of an unchangeable God? Can it be relied on as true? And if false and corrupt does not the Catholic Church do well when she prevents her children from accepting and devouring this poisoned spiritual food? For what is falsehood but moral poison whether it be wrapped in a so-called Bible or in any other literary package? When therefore the Albigenses in the thirteenth century made the Bible say that there were two Gods, two eternally co existing supreme beings—that there was no efficacy in infant baptism—that marriage was sinful—that prayer and almsgiving were superfluous, and other enormities of the kind, the Catholic Church considered it time to put an embargo on the indiscriminate reading and interpretation of the Bible. She continued these salutary restrictions so long as it was necessary for the preservation of the sacred writings. She expended money upon the translation of Bibles into foreign tongues, upon presses to print and ships to carry whole cargoes of Bibles into heathen lands, upon agents to distribute them among the benighted heathen, upon societies to supervise this phenomenal supply of Bibles, and yet—*Parturient montes et nascetur ridiculus mus*—all these vast resources, this enormous expenditure, these outpourings of zeal

going on in the Protestant world for the last eighty years and more, have not brought forth the conversion of one single nation. Mr. Wiggrove Clark, in 1855, said: "Whoever asserts that the Protestant missionaries are making sincere in the Bible, that man was not free but foreordained to heaven or to hell. The Anabaptists based the terrible excesses and the hideous licentiousness with which they flooded Europe on the Bible. Murder and rapine, adultery and bigamy and polygamy, robbery and theft, blasphemy and impiety, every conceivable crime has found its justification in the Bible ever since the Bible, or what pretends to be the Bible, has been put into the hands of everybody, to be read and interpreted according to everybody's private judgment. And now, in conclusion, let us ask, who is it that values the Bible most highly? Is it the Protestant Christians who have cut it up, mutilated it, changed it by interpretation, corrupted it by the introduction of errors, falsified it by forgeries and made it an instrument for the defence of falsehood and immorality, or is it the Catholic Church, who has guarded it with jealous care and watched over it for centuries and prevented by her wise laws and salutary restrictions errors from creeping into it? Who values the Bible more highly, the Protestant who prints and ships it rendered into foreign tongues, and scatters it broadcast on coasts and river banks and puts it into the hands of ignorant and untutored savages who understand it not, to be converted by them into gun wads and wrapping paper and other purposes for which its leaves come handy; the Protestant who sticks it into receptacles in railway carriages where it is never looked at or becomes the butt of the atheist's ridicule; who hawks it about as agricultural fairs and puts it on a level with plows and hogs and sheep and whistles; who forces it into the hands of men and women who will make clear lighters of it and use it to kindle the fire in the kitchen stove, or is it the Catholic Church who warns her children not to debase so sacred an object in any way whatever, not to expose it to ridicule or to profane use, who declares it a sin to use its words in playfulness or joke. Who esteems the Bible more highly? Is it the Protestant who interprets it as he pleases, makes it assert a trisolar God if he is a Unitarian, makes it uphold infant baptism for one man and reject it for another; makes it preach eternity of hell fire at one time and universal salvation at another. Is it the Protestant who by the many contradictory and contrary interpretations of it has made the Bible an object of scorn to the infidel and rendered it impossible for an honest to gather great audience and abundance of sheeple from among the ladies and gentlemen of America? Or is it the Catholic Church who permits no man to substitute his word for the word of God, and therefore in whose hands the Bible never contradicts itself? We leave the answer not to bigots but to the fair minded people, who, reflecting on the facts gathered together in this short sketch will without doubt give their verdict in favor of the Catholic Church.

J. J. EGAN.

DIOCESE OF HAMILTON.

CATHOLIC LITERARY SOCIETY.

A meeting was held last evening in the hall, corner James and King streets, at which a Catholic Literary Society was formed by His Lordship Bishop Dowling, assisted by Fathers McEvey, Halm and O'Sullivan. It is proposed by this society to have debates on questions of the day, interesting to every one, as well as entertainments during the coming winter. Officers were elected and committees formed. The officers elected for the ensuing term were: President, Mr. J. P. Holden; Vice-President, Mr. Jas. Henigan; Secretary, Mr. Wm. Hanter; Treasurer, Mr. Wm. Howard; Chaplain, Father O'Sullivan. A committee of ten was appointed to draft a constitution and laws and report to a meeting called for Monday night next. A committee was also appointed to arrange for a meeting room for the winter.

LEAGUE OF THE CROSS.

For some time back the members of St. Patrick's and St. Mary's branches of the League of the Cross have been considering the advisability of amalgamating, and finally concluded to hold a joint meeting and make arrangements for bringing the two branches together. The meeting was held on Tuesday evening, November 19th, in the E. B. A. hall, the subject being in direct conformity with the views of the members, great interest was manifested throughout, and it was only when it was finally decided to have one branch of this society in the city that general satisfaction was felt at the successful termination of the affair. Although nothing but the best of friendship existed between the two branches a great deal of rivalry was formerly carried on in the matter of increasing the membership, and now that they are in one, on doubt they will make rapid progress, as the views of the members seem to blend to a great degree towards the amelioration of the society. The election of officers resulted as follows: Rev. Father Hinchee, Chaplain; J. W. Gamblings, President; J. Connolly, Vice President; Nicholas Back, Treasurer; Patrick Hagarty, Marshal; Secretary, K. J. Tobin.

PEOPLE MAKING THEIR OWN RELIGIONS.

"What do the laity think of—for in these matters the views of the laity ultimately prevail." These words, Mr. Editor, conclude an article in Saturday's Globe on the subject of "Union between the Presbyterians and Methodists," an article which favors changes and modifications sufficient to reconcile the beliefs of the two bodies. Being, no doubt, strictly true, the words quoted would occasion no comment among Protestants; but to Catholics, whose religion is from Christ Himself, their assertion the reflection that Protestantism, in whatever form we find it, is of purely human origin. That, in fact, the people make their own religions, "for, in these matters," as the Globe puts it, "the views of the laity ultimately prevail." CATHOLIC.