

**THE CATHOLIC RECORD**  
 Published weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.  
 Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.  
 Editor—REV. GEO. R. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Mistake of Modern India."  
 T. J. COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor.  
 Messrs. DONAT CHOW, LUKE KING and JOHN NICH are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transmit all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD.  
 Agent for Ottawa—P. J. Coffey, Esq.  
 Agent for Alexandria, Geneseeville and Leominster—Mr. Donald A. McLaughlin.  
 Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion.  
 Approved by the Bishop of London, and recommended by the Archbishop of St. Boniface, the Bishops of Ottawa, Hamilton, Kingston, and Peterboro, and leading Catholic Clergymen throughout the Dominion.  
 All correspondence on business should be addressed to the Proprietor.  
 Advertisers must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.  
 Persons writing for a change of address should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

**Catholic Record.**

London, Ont., Sept. 29th, 1888.

VERY REV. DR. O'CONNOR.

Thursday last was indeed a day of jubilee and of intense, heartfelt rejoicing to both the pupils and professors of Assumption College, Sandwich. Immediately after the Ecclesiastical Conference, in which His Lordship Bishop Walsh and about thirty of his diocesan clergy participated, a movement was made towards the spacious study hall. There were already gathered about a dozen priests from the neighboring diocese and city of Detroit, with Right Rev. Bishop Burgess, and Very Rev. Father Joes, V. G. The pupils of the college, to the number of one hundred, with several of the Rev. Fathers of the Order of St. Basil, from Toronto, Owen Sound, and St. Ann's, Detroit, occupied the college benches and extra chairs provided for the occasion. The Right Rev. Bishop Walsh, accompanied by Very Rev. Father Vincent, Provincial, and Rev. D. O'Connor, President, ascended the platform and when all had been seated, one of the college pupils arose and read the following touching and beautiful address of welcome to His Lordship, this being the first visit of Bishop Walsh to Assumption College since his return from his decennial visit to the Holy See:

Let me then, your Lordship, Less than a year ago we were granted the privilege of saluting Your Lordship on the eve of your departure for Rome. It was not without apprehensions, surely, but still, with more of Christian hope, that the good God would watch over every step of that way, and bring you back in renewed strength of mind and body, that we said good bye.

And we accompanied that journey not merely in spirit and by our prayers; in these days of multiplied news, a Bishop's movements challenge large attention, and in the full accounts we were careful to read of the honors done you by the way, and especially in the affectionate greeting of the Holy Father himself, we found some compensation for your protracted absence. There was a pleasure and an honorable pride in these readings; but the experience of a day of an entirely different nature.

Every apprehension which love suggested is now gone, our best hopes are realized, the difficulties and perils of that weary journey are no longer an anxiety; and in gladness and joy, with the warm feelings of children welcoming a father after a trying separation, we offer you our congratulations upon the successful accomplishment of the great work of going to see Peter and our most earnest thanks, that in spite of duties, always heavy, but doubly accumulated by absence, you have so early done us the honor of this visit.

May God, who has been so propitious thus far, multiply His favors on Your Lordship's head, and by His mighty grace, convert the heavy labours of the Episcopate, as he has manifestly converted the toils of this great journey, into means of increasing health and strength, and prolong that life which is so very precious to the Church, but especially so tenderly loved by those whom you have favored as much as ourselves.

Signed on behalf of the faculty and students.

In reply to our feeling address, Bishop Walsh stated that it was gratifying to him to learn that, while away from his diocese in distant countries, he was not forgotten in Sandwich College, nor his name omitted in the pious prayers of its inmates. He could assure them in return, that Sandwich College was not forgotten by him, and that when questioned by His Holiness Pope Leo, as to the educational establishments of his diocese, it was with pardonable pride he mentioned to the Supreme Pontiff the name and fame of Assumption College. As an additional proof of his not forgetting Sandwich, His Lordship stated that he solicited from the Sacred College of the Propaganda the title and honor of "Dr. of Divinity" for their venerable president, Rev. Father O'Connor. This assertion of His Lordship was greeted by loud acclamations of all present. The Bishop continued by stating that the eminent services of Father O'Connor, his lengthy and successful career as President of a college, long and well-established in the confidence and admiration of the priests and bishops of the two neighboring dioceses, besides his own many personal merits and virtues, fully entitled him to the honor he solicited from the Holy Father. Cardinal Simeoni graciously acceded to His Lordship's request, and he now felt sincere pleasure in reading the diploma which conferred the title of "D. D." upon Rev. Father O'Connor.

His Lordship then handed the parchment to Father O'Connor, and placed the

Doctor's cap which he had brought from Rome on the head of the venerable recipient.

Bishop Burgess then arose and, in the name of the priests of the Diocese of Detroit, presented the newly-made Doctor with a gold ring and emerald setting, which His Lordship declared to be the spontaneous gift of the young priests of Detroit who had received their education under Father O'Connor's tutelage in Assumption College. His Lordship's remarks were received with loud applause.

Rev. Father McManus, of Battle Creek Mich., presented a gold chalice, and Rev. Dean O'Brien, of Kalamazoo, handed in a purse of money. The Rev. Dean made some very felicitious remarks as to the suddenness of the occasion, and the very short time at his disposal to communicate with Father O'Connor's reverend friends and former pupils in Michigan.

The newly made doctor seemed very much abashed by all the praises lavished on him, and the honor so unexpectedly conferred. Not until he saw the unusual gathering of friends from far and near, closing in around the college that morning from every direction, did he begin to suspect that some agreeable surprise was in store for him. He accepted this honor with very great pleasure, for two reasons: first, to mark his gratitude to His Lordship Bishop Walsh, who had by this act of extreme kindness added to the multitudinous obligations under which for so many years, even since childhood, he felt so deeply indebted to His Lordship. He accepted it, secondly, because he considered it a very high honor conferred upon the faculty of the college and upon the Order of which he felt himself representative. He, from his heart, and on the part of the college, thanked His Lordship for this high honor, as well as for his many other favors and kindnesses, and hoped he and his colleagues would ever continue to merit the approbation and esteem of London's great and holy Bishop. Dr. O'Connor then expressed his unbounded gratitude towards Bishop Burgess and the young priests of Detroit for their thoughtfulness and extreme liberality in bestowing on him so many and such valuable gifts, of which he felt himself quite unworthy, and trusted that, as in the past, the sunshine of unbroken confidence and mutual affection had brightened their path in life, so no cloud of mistrust would ever arise to darken their future.

There was much rejoicing and clapping of hands at the end of Dr. O'Connor's touching acknowledgments, after which all retired to partake of a sumptuous repast in the spacious dining hall of Assumption College.

**DISTRIBUTION OF THE JESUITS.**

It will be remembered that a few weeks ago the Toronto Mail founded a most savage attack against the Jesuits on the number belonging to that order which it supposed to be in the Province of Quebec, and which was stated to be "300 picked men," whose business it was to gain the political control of the whole Province. We pointed out, at the time, that the total number of Jesuit priests in Quebec is 24, according to the official reports of each diocese, and we stated that there are some "lay brothers etc., who would certainly not bring the total beyond 70." The *Etudes Religieuses*, in a late number, gives the distribution of the Jesuit missionaries in various parts of the world, and in every case the number of priests is more than double the coadjutors and scholastics together, so that the total number of Jesuits in the Province of Quebec would be about fifty: say 34 priests, and 16 coadjutors and scholastics. The *Mail* calls these "picked men". It is not very likely that the most prominent thirty-four men of the world renowned order should be selected for the Quebec mission. We may therefore safely assume that the Quebec Jesuits are pretty similar to the members of the order in other countries, and especially in the United States. They are, like the rest of their confreres, zealous and devoted priests, well able to discharge the offices to which they are allotted, whether as having parish charge, or as teachers in their colleges. But the true state of the case being made known, the recklessness and unscrupulousness of the *Mail* in its statements of facts and figures becomes apparent.

The details of the distribution of Jesuits fully bear out our statement of the case. The whole number of Jesuits in the world in purely missionary work is 2,377, of whom 1,130 are scattered in various parts of America, including the United States, Canada, British Honduras, Brazil and Peru. Yet whenever a No-Popery declaimer wishes to excite the Protestant popular feeling against the order, he exaggerates the number beyond all bounds in order to make it appear that there is great danger threatening the Protestants of the country from so powerful a body plotting the destruction of their civil and religious liberty, whereas all who know ever so little about the order know them to be unassuming clergymen, zealous and learned indeed, but intent only upon the performance of their duty.

In the Balkan peninsula there are forty-

five Jesuits, in Africa 223, especially in Egypt, Madagascar and the Zimbezi region; in Asia 699, especially in Armenia, Syria, India, and China. In the last named country there are 195. In Oceania the number is 270.

The great centres of Jesuit missionary activity are the Zambesi, Syria, where there are 142 Jesuits, Bengal, Kiangsu in China, the Philippine Archipelago, the Central United States, Cuba, Ecuador, Peru, Chili, and Paraguay. From a body so universally diffused, and so limited in the number of its members, it could scarcely be expected that the *Mail's* imaginary "300 picked men" would be sent to the Province of Quebec.

**A MARRIAGE BY DISPENSATION.**

The marriage of Amadeus, Duke of Aosta and brother of King Humbert, took place at Turin, Italy, on Tuesday, the 11th, inst. The bride was the Princess Letitia Bonaparte. The bridegroom is the uncle of the bride, and the marriage was celebrated by dispensation from the Pope, the condition being annexed that the union should take place outside the ancient Papal States. The dispensation was granted because the Duke "had always been a faithful son of the Church."

Few marriages have attracted so much attention from the press as this one, owing in great measure to the close relationship between the bridegroom and the bride, and some of the Protestant and Infidel journals make very unfavorable comments on the action of the Pope in permitting such a marriage to take place. Some have gone so far as to say that the Pope has authorized incest.

The *Londonly Warder* is among those journals which state that, for the consideration of a small sum of money, the Pope has given permission to commit incest; and apropos of the discussions which have of late taken place on the subject of indulgences, the wise writer in that journal declares that the dispensation granted to the Duke and his niece to contract marriage is a permission or license to commit sin, and that therefore the accusation against the Catholic Church that she grants such licenses for money is correct. We take the *Warder* merely as a sample of what Protestants and Infidels are saying on the subject, not on account of any particular force which is to be found in the comments of that journal.

Does not the *Warder* see that if a valid marriage can be contracted between the two parties, there is no sin whatever in their so contracting it? Now, if he will turn to Exodus vi, 20, and to Num. xvii, 58, 59, he will find that Jacob and Amram, the parents of Moses, were aunt and nephew; precisely of the same degree of kindred as are the Duke of Aosta and his niece, Princess Letitia. Such a marriage, then, is not contrary to the laws of nature at least. Moreover, before the special laws of kindred were established among the Jews, prohibiting, for the Jews, marriage within certain degrees of kindred, marriages were contracted as a frequent occurrence between kindred to a very close degree. The prohibited degrees established in Leviticus xviii, like the other judicial and ceremonial laws of the Jews, do not oblige Christians, except so far as they constitute part of the natural law, which is and was at all times obligatory. And it is the case that the law prohibiting marriage of uncle and niece, or aunt and nephew, is, under Christianity, merely an ecclesiastical law. It is a law established by the Church, and the same authority which made the law can suspend its operation, or even revoke it. With proper ecclesiastical dispensation, such a marriage is perfectly lawful, and in the case of the Duke of Aosta, that dispensation was obtained. There is therefore no incest, no sin of any kind in the matter, and the *Warder's* picture of the Pope selling a license to commit sin is purely a fancy sketch.

But what are we to say of the donation which the Duke of Aosta made to the Holy Father? We have only the *Warder's* word for it that the amount he states was given. Now the fact is that when marriage dispensations are given by the Church, there is no price affixed to them whatever. Those who obtain the dispensation from the laws of the Church are expected to make an offering for a purely charitable purpose, if they are able to do so; but neither the Pope, nor the Bishops, nor the clergy, ever receive a cent of dispensation money, though they may receive the amount which is to be distributed in charity. It is not unlikely that the Duke of Aosta made an offering for some charitable purpose.

Thus the whole case of the *Londonly Warder* passes off like so much smoke.

We should say a word, however, on the absurd proof which the *Warder* advances that the marriage of the Duke is an act of incest. It says that such marriages are forbidden by "divine and ecclesiastical law." As far as the civil law is concerned, if the marriage was in accordance with ecclesiastical law, it was in accordance with civil law of Italy. The whole case, therefore, resolves itself into a matter of ecclesiastical law, and, as we have seen, the ecclesiastical law was perfectly observed. It is very easy for Protestant and Infidel journals, having no fixed and

certain principles to guide them, to adjudicate everything wrong which has been done by the Pope, and everything right which their own fancy dictates to them. We all know what bitter controversies have raged, even very lately, and are still raging among Protestants, regarding marriage with a deceased wife's sister. The Westminster Confession of Faith declares such a marriage to be contrary to the law of God, yet Presbyterians now commonly admit that such a marriage is lawful. Most other Protestants make no difficulty about it whatsoever, and a few years ago one of the most prominent Methodist clergymen in this Province contracted such a marriage without creating any serious comment or scandal on the part of his co-religionists, and even the new Presbyterian Creed, which is up for consideration before the Presbyterian Church of England, and which, it is expected, will be substituted for the Westminster Confession, leaves out the clause condemning such alliances. It is evident, then, that these Protestant denominations create their principles of ethics according to the fancy of the times; or will the *Warder* say that the Rev. William Morley Parshon had an indulgence from his brother Protestants to commit incest?

In the Catholic Church the case is different. Her principles always hold good, and they need only to be properly explained to be understood. In both cases which we have mentioned, there exists an impediment, but that impediment is of ecclesiastical institution, and the supreme authority of the Church has the power to remove it, or dispense from it. This is what the Pope did in the case of the Duke of Aosta; and in the case of Henry the Eighth, Queen Catherine was similarly the wife of Henry, by dispensation, though she had been the wife of his brother Arthur. Henry pretended, it is true, to have remorse of conscience, against the marriage, when he fixed his affections upon Anne Boleyn, but every one acknowledges that this remorse was but a hypocritical pretence. The marriage of Queen Catherine was recognized as valid both by ecclesiastical and civil law, and his daughter Mary, by Queen Catherine, was duly recognized as the lawful heirress to the English throne, before Elizabeth.

The Church has wisely instituted impediments to marriage within certain degrees of kindred, but there may be valid reasons on account of which a dispensation may be granted, and it is for the Pope, the Head of the Church, to decide when sufficient reasons exist for such dispensation. The Duke of Aosta's marriage, having been celebrated with that dispensation, is therefore perfectly lawful.

Amadeus was for three years King of Spain, but he abdicated the throne, owing to the determined opposition manifested against him by the Legationists and other factions into which the Spanish people were divided. It is consolatory to find that, notwithstanding the difficulties which exist between the Holy Father, and his brother King Humbert, Amadeus remains devoted to the Church and to its Supreme Head.

**COERCION RAMPANT AT BRADFORD.**

By the distribution of free railway tickets a large crowd was secured at a conference of Radical Liberal Unionists at Bradford on the 19th inst. Lord Hartington wrote a letter to the conference congratulating the party upon the successes of the Unionists. He said every thing that had occurred since the Home Rule bill confirmed the soundness of the judgment which had inspired their action. The policy of their opponents, he declared, had shown itself to be more and more based on disorder and lawlessness. The events of the last session of Parliament had proved that the Unionist alliance was capable of providing the country with a legislative policy which was of a distinctly popular and practical character. As long as the Unionists continued their duty of repressing crime, while seeking to satisfy the legislative wants of the people, the party would resist the attacks of the enemies of England and Ireland. The conference adopted resolutions approving the policy of the Government, and affirming the necessity of an improved organization of the party.

Mr. Chamberlain, in an address to the conference, said he believed that the healing of the rupture in the Liberal party was improbable, and almost impossible. The Gladstonians carefully avoided putting a programme before the country, because they did not know what the unstable politician who was leading them might next propose. The speaker defended the action of the Irish Executive, claiming that the course pursued had been strictly in accordance with Parliamentary legislation. He denied that evictions were unfair. They might fall harshly upon the victims of the Plan of Campaign, but a greater injustice would be done to the cause of social order if people were allowed to defy the law with impunity and evictions were stopped on account of the threats of members of the National League. The Unionists would continue in the exercise of their duty of

protecting the minority in Ireland, and preserving the faith, honour, and integrity of the country.

In view of the murderous results of eviction, as it is carried on through the support given by these gentlemen to the Government, this task of supporting the Government in repressing crime exhibits no small amount of assurance. Mr. Chamberlain, however, does show a candor for which we look in vain in Lord Hartington's utterance. Mr. Chamberlain avows that the Irishmen for whom he wishes to legislate are the minority. He has no care for the bulk of the people. A declaration more heartless than this it is difficult to conceive.

The general opinion expressed on Mr. Chamberlain's speech is that he has finally abandoned all hope of re-association with the Liberals, and that the very great bitterness which he displayed in his Bradford speech indicates that he wishes to gain complete confidence from the Tories, by showing them that his own Toryism is extreme. His jers at the Liberals on account of their hopes of a split between the Tories and their quondam Liberal supporters, are described as "savoring of coarseness," and his approval of Irish evictions in all their hideous brutality is delivered slowly and emphatically. In spite of all his enthusiastic Toryism, the opinion is freely uttered that his enthusiasm is disgusting rather than convincing, and that his Toryism is overdone. It is only a few days since Mr. Chamberlain wrote a long preface to the *Birmingham Post's* "Sketch of the Unionist Policy," and he then stated that this policy must be more than a negative policy, or the coercive policy now pursued. It appears, that like Ben'am, the power of truth influences him once in a while to advocate a just course.

**INTIMIDATION IN IRELAND.**

While the Resident Magistrate appointed by Secretary Balfour to try cases under the Coercion Act are so ready to convict persons accused of intimidation, if they hoot the police, or toast tin horns, or cheer for Mr. Gladstone, it is pleasant to read of an occasional case where the prosecution collapses from the sheer want of a particle of evidence to support it, so that even these Removables, as Mr. Morley so aptly styled them, cannot stretch their consciences so far as to convict, though they know that Mr. Balfour requires a good crop of convictions as an evidence of their fitness for the position which they hold at his pleasure.

A case of this kind came up at Dungleon on the 21st ult., before Magistrate Hamilton and Burke. Mr. Markham, the District Inspector, prosecuted James Ward for intimidating one Joyce from drawing water for Maurice Doyle, from a pump which appears to have been the property of Sally O'Donnell. Joyce was the principal witness, and when the case was called, the Inspector asked for an adjournment, as Joyce was too drunk to give evidence. He was, in fact, lying drunk in bed. The adjournment was granted, and when the case was called up again Joyce was brought forward as the witness for the Crown. The Counsel for the defence objected to Joyce as a witness on the plea that he was a simpleton, and did not understand the nature of an oath. The witness, however, was admitted to be sworn. The prosecuting Attorney, Mr. Markham, asked Joyce, "Did Ward strike you with a stone?" This question was objected to by Mr. Boyle, who said: "This is monstrous, putting the answer into the simpleton's mouth." The bench sustained the objection, and the question was not answered. Mr. Markham then asked, "Why did you stop drawing water for Maurice Doyle?" Joyce answered: "Because Sally O'Donnell allowed me not to do it." To the consternation of the Crown Counsel, it thus appeared that the intimidation came from Sally O'Donnell, and not from Ward.

Mr. Markham saw that his case was breaking down, so he cried out to the police: "Call Sally O'Donnell as a witness." The Counsel for Ward objected to this, as the Crown could not use the evidence of a third party for the purpose of rebutting the evidence of their own witness. The objection was sustained by the bench and the case was dismissed.

Another case of intimidation, equally ludicrous, was brought before the Coercion Court at Cork on 31st August, and though the records of the Court show many occasions when most absurd charges of this kind were sustained, this was the most brazen attempt yet made to establish such a charge.

Constable Cooper swore that he was called "Balfour's bloodhound" by a crowd of lads ranging from eight to eighteen years of age. He had secured one prisoner from this formidable band of intimidators, in a miscreant named Pat Murphy, who was brought into Court under the protection of his mother. It was then found that the intimidator was five years old. This was too much, even for the Removable Magistrate, and the case was dismissed, to the great discomfiture of the Constable who was so zealous for the preservation of "law and order."

Another remarkable case was brought before the Court at Crookkeen on the 6th

inst. District Inspector Hill testified that he was doing duty in evicting tenants in that town on the 14th of August. A crowd was assembled whom he warned against creating any disturbance, and though no violence was offered and no breach of the peace occurred, a man named Patrick Loughrey called for three cheers for Parnell, Davitt and Wm. O'Brien. Several other constables gave evidence to similar effect, one of them adding that he saw Loughrey beating a drum. No evidence was adduced that the object of beating the drum was to excite disturbance, yet the Magistrate, Hodder and Keough, bound the defendant to keep the peace under penalty of £20 surety from himself, and two other sureties of £10 each, or one month's imprisonment. Magistrate Hodder had the effrontery to suggest to the prosecution to call witnesses to show for what purpose the drum was beaten, but this suggestion was not acted upon. Loughrey elected to be sent to prison, and he has, besides, for this frivolous accusation, been deprived of his situation as rate collector. Such is the manner in which justice is administered, and such are the "crimes" which make up the criminal calendar in Ireland.

**BOY BURGLARS.**

A band of boy burglars has been arrested in Chicago, the youngest of them being eight years of age. This one, named William Morgan, is the captain of the gang, owing to his shrewdness. His lieutenant is aged ten, and two others are thirteen years of age. Their method was to crawl by the back yards and saw a panel out of a door through which Morgan, being very small, entered the house and secured any articles on which he could lay his hands. They always took the keys of the house for use in future operations. Godless education and the reading of sensational dime novels are doing bad work for the rising generation.

**CLERICAL SCANDALS.**

A paragraph has been going the rounds of the press to the effect that a clerical scandal in France has been the cause which has induced the French Government to exclude religious orders from teaching in France. The Protestant religious press have given special prominence to this report, as it is so seldom that anything injurious can be said of the morals of the Catholic priesthood. It is a good omen to find that something of the kind has occurred even in far away France. But on this occasion the nature of the scandal has been altogether passed over in silence. It is very possible and likely that the scandal is a fiction. We are not accustomed to record in our columns the frequent delinquencies of Protestant clergymen of all sorts, but we would remind the *Christian Guardian* and other journals which are so ready to pounce upon even the most trivial and most improbable stories uttered against Catholic priests, that scarcely a day passes that we are not shocked by some unexpected enormity perpetrated by ministers. It is only a short time since our own community was shocked by two disgraceful scandals by Methodist ministers, one of which was cloaked by Niagara Conference in such a way that the punishment inflicted is justly considered as no punishment at all. This is the case of Rev. Mr. Longley. It is besides notorious that the Methodists in this country encourage such respectable characters as Widdows, Mrs. Diss Dabar, Edith O'Gorman and Dr. Fulton to deliver slanderous No Popery lectures, and Widdows was interrupted, only a few months ago, in the delivery of a course of such lectures, in London, England, in order to be sent to prison for detestable crimes. It is not long since the Baptist clergyman, Rev. Mr. Downes, of Boston, was detected in repeated criminal acts, and on the 20th of April last a Presbyterian minister, Rev. Mr. Hermance, shot himself in his pulpit, at White Plains, near New York. In August a M. E. Minister, Rev. David Seymour, of Jamesville, Minn., deserted his wife and five children and eloped to Liverpool with a married woman, a Mrs. Henry, who also abandoned her husband and two children. Again, not long ago Rev. C. W. Millous, of Washington St. Methodist Church, New York, was found guilty on two charges of bad conduct. In July, Rev. J. R. Hutchinson, Baptist, of St. John, N. E., was also seriously delinquent, and within the last few days the Rev. J. B. Allison, Methodist, forged an order in Guelph, supposed to be from his father, a farmer in Nassauways, on which he obtained goods to the value of \$30.

The following instance of cruelty practiced by a Protestant clergyman in Ballinapitule is an example of a viciousness of another kind, almost unparalleled:

"Three men named Sealy, one of them a Protestant clergyman, were brought up on summonses at Ballinapitule Petty Sessions charged with attacking the house of one of their tenants named Driscoll and forcibly breaking in the door with a hatchet and crowbar, and also with assaulting Mrs. Driscoll and her children. According to the evidence, Dr. Sealy and Mr. Leout, a solicitor, broke in the door without warning the inmates, and when inside, the doctor and

his brother, Rev. Mr. the woman and children with a cane and shoving defendants were returned.

We might multiply in refrain. We do not in these depraved men following of their respective do say that the careful received by the Cath before their admission office, and the aids to s by the Sacrament of Church, make the inst when priests forget the to such an extent.

The Methodists, espec more careful not to t readily.

**A GENUINE PA**

The Boston Republic re occurrence illustrativ and earnest patriotism w the humblest sons of E It is a most touching e tory of the struggle for I

A curious, interesting m on Friday evening in th man who was concerned Mr. Robert F. Walsh, of staff of the Dublin *Even present a resident of th the story thus: "A new last night on Washington apparently about twelve bright as a new cent piece pardon, sir!" "Well! what 'I'm an Irishman, sir, and me if you will send M money for me. But I w my name a secret, for I g my mother." I looked at and thought I had got bo proverbially smart. Amer But no he was genuine I what he said. Yo was he had read o the caumies which the T Parnell and the Irish party defence fund, and like a little brick, he wanted to th was so odd. I cons the treasurer of his sub from it will learn a lesson o of the poor Irish at th sands of dollars could no pointedly prove. But let to the adult and rich Irish I shall say no more abou dent speaks for itself. It Mr. Parnell, and I hope o our Irish American friend answer well and promptly*

**MR. DILLON'S R**

The unexpected and su Mr. John Dillon from D given general pleasure to friends and admirers of patriot. It was very jus his incarceration meant d It was perpetrated with th Bomba Balfour, who by h ties committed against he earned this title, was perfe that Mr. Dillon's fall cons not stand the hardship o confinement, and where many "criminals" in th sense, the selection of Mr. incarceration could not b desire of getting him ou foul means, since fair m accomplish the object.

To Mr. Dillon's urem sustaining the Nationalist a very great extent the large and compact body members in the House of no one knows better that that the power of a small leaders is great when such any cause. Hence he very his secret when he told Mr that the removal of a few death would effectually Nationalist agitation. M then named as one who to the hardships of pri Larkin died in Kilkenny treatment to which he Mr. Mandeville did not his treatment there was su not survive after his ret after he came out he too to Mr. Balfour's diabolical the Irish question. Mr. D fully justified Mr. Balfour tions, for he was loing and otherwise falling very He did not complain of h ment, but public opinion outrage that a member loved by all for his am and many good qualities, a his learning and eloque subjected to such treatme offence than addressing in to cling to their homeste law, this was no crime e even before man, outside O it was thought that Balfo public opinion to effect his arose the fear that Mr. D kept in jail to die, or a health was so shattered leave the prison to die at

The Government seem unwilling to brave longer