



THE BISHOP'S ADDRESS.

A Letter Concerning It From Father McDonagh.

He Tells What Bishop Cleary Said in His Discourse at Napanee—Some Interesting Observations.

To the Editor of the Kingston Daily News.

Sir,—In your issue of last Wednesday an anonymous communication appears, dated "Napanee, November 15," purporting to be a report of the reply of His Lordship, the Bishop of Kingston, to the address presented to him by the ladies of the church of which I am the pastor. I cannot conceive who the author of this might be. There were several Protestant ladies and gentlemen among the Catholic congregation during the services at which the Bishop is said to have pronounced the discourse published by you, but my personal acquaintance with them forbids me to suppose that any of them would commit to grave a breach of religious hospitality as to misrepresent the teaching of bishop or priest through our courtesy they were privileged to listen to. Much less could I believe for a moment that any one of them would offer so grave an outrage to their Catholic fellow-citizens as to distort the Bishop's instruction on the cultivation of modest deportment into the odious accusations which your anonymous correspondent imputes to him in reference to the "women and girls of this country" without limitation or distinction. Be pleased to allow me to inform your readers that from the beginning to the end of his discourse the Bishop passed no observations whatever upon "the women" of this country, whom you expressly classify as distinguished from "the girls." You do not indeed imitate the Toronto Mail and the Montreal Gazette by writing an editorial paragraph appealing to the injured feelings of "the wives and mothers of Canada," but the document published by you amounts to almost the same. The entire instruction was directed to the manners of youth and the laws of social reserve and modesty and gentleness required for the Christian formation of character, particularly in females. Even your anonymous correspondent sufficiently signifies this in his concluding sentence: "His Lordship contrasted in very caustic language the system in vogue in this country, and that of the old world, completing his remarks with an appeal to the young girls of his congregation to preserve their modesty as a priceless jewel." This represents the whole burden of his discourse. The Bishop did undoubtedly contrast the social demeanor of young females trained in the old country, according to the traditional rules of Christian propriety with that of our new country whose disregard of those excellent rules in the system of public education shows itself too frequently and painfully in certain incongruities and irregularities of behaviour instanced by him. He said that "boldness of look" and "hard staring into the face of the other sex" and "loudness of speech" and "unreserve of manner" and sometimes also "unfeminine rudeness," exhibited by rushing in and out of railway cars are evidences of the defective training of female youth, which he himself has often witnessed and has often heard others comment upon since his advent to Canada. He made emphatic reference to the practice, unknown in European countries, but seemingly claimed as a privilege of their sex by many young ladies in this country, of conversing in loud, shrill tones in the railway cars to the great annoyance of their fellow-passengers, and this he described to "screaming and screeching" rather than lady-like conversation. I venture to say that there are few persons accustomed to travel who have not from time to time been made painfully sensible of this specimen of defective training of the female youth of Canada. Your anonymous correspondent chooses to extend His Lordship's remarks by making them refer "to the women as well as to the girls," and "not to any class or section of them, or to occasional instances of such irregularity; but to all the women, or, as the Mail and Gazette would have it, to 'the wives and mothers of Canada.'" In this sense, and it is the substantial significance of the anonymous libel, the statement is absolutely untrue.

A great deal of malignity of purpose is displayed in the anonymous writer's transfer of certain of the Bishop's words from the sentence in which they were spoken to some other connection in which they have a meaning nowise intended by his Lordship. But I will not follow him through this course of trespass on the patience of your readers, since I should transcribe almost every second sentence of the libel in giving instances of this unworthy procedure. One sentence at the conclusion of the libellous document calls for special remark, because it may go far to explain many of the incongruities of manner censured by the Bishop. "Putting young men and young girls together and allowing them to associate without restraint, as is done in the schools here, is an abomination which even Pagans would not tolerate, and which has led to the destruction of all female modesty." The last clause of this sentence is, like many others throughout the libel, transformed from a just maxim of morality into an offensive imputation against the women of Canada by the substitution of one word for another. The Bishop said "tends" to; your correspondent writes "led" to. As regards the general proposition announced by His Lordship, which he has likewise proclaimed on many similar occasions, I believe his judgment stands approved, not alone by the maxims of Catholic theology and the rules of the church, but also by moralists of the highest character and widest experience; belonging to various religious denominations; and it is a fact that the medical faculty in the United States have protested against the practice for reasons proper to their profession. (See the Evening Mail of last Thursday concurring

report of his address is prepared by angry men, sent round to all the journals for publication, and comments of denunciation against the Bishop. In the anonymous document itself the Bishop is charged with imputing immodesty to all the women and girls of Canada, and some of the editorial articles emphasize this yet more unjustly by interpreting it direct against the "wives and mothers of Canada." He (the Bishop) protested against all this as untrue and gravely unjust. He did not speak at all of women, much less of wives and mothers, but addressed himself solely to the manners of young people, telling how they should be formed on the Christian type, and particularly in regard of females, and complaining of the neglect of this important element in the public education of this country. He had mentioned certain irregularities of manner that are too frequently observable in the youth of this country, such as loudness of speech in the railway cars, staring fixedly at persons of the opposite sex, and other forms of unreserve in deportment which had sometimes come under his own notice and he had heard others remark upon, and he argued that these were indications of a defective system of training in the public institution. He said it was wholly untrue that he had attributed those irregularities to all the young females of Canada; he spoke only of instances that were frequently visible to every traveller. It is shamefully untrue that he imputed immodesty or immorality to any of them. When he used the word modest in that address at Napanee, it was always in reference to deportment and the forms of outward manner, and everyone knows that in this connection the word has a definite signification, and that to torture such a phrase into a charge of immodesty or immorality, as some of the journals have done, is a gross injustice and calumny. He said, in conclusion, that it is quite usual to enforce the necessity of general regulations, whether demanded of Government or of educational institutions, by reference to instances of irregularity, and that no one interprets such reference as a charge against the entire community. Thus the cause of temperance is every day advocated by arguments and maxims relating to well known instances of intemperance in this or that city or district, and no one thinks of charging the speakers with vilifying the whole body of the inhabitants in such cities, towns and districts as drunkards. The treatment he (the Bishop) had received from the press and the publication of the anonymous libel and their unjust comments extending his words beyond their scope and meaning, had caused him great pain, and this had come upon him at a time when he is suffering from physical exhaustion after a laborious visitation of his diocese begun at the end of May and continued up to the present week. Instead of the needful rest which he was preparing to take after so much toil, he finds himself burdened with this new and most painful load of anxiety and distress.

Does not the appearance of this anonymous production immediately after the issue of the Bishop's pastoral on the "Provisional expulsion of Catholic children from the public schools" on the 13th instant—the Montreal Gazette on the 15th instant, Kingston Daily News on the 16th, and the Toronto Mail on the 17th—supply a key for the understanding of the whole plot? And is there not a mystery in the diversity of dates assigned to the transmission of the concocted document, the Montreal Gazette and the Mail dating it "Napanee, November 10th," and you dating it November 15th? Is anyone expected to believe that the editor of the Montreal Gazette kept this precious composition locked up in his desk from the 10th to the 15th instant, and that the editor of the Mail, the most prominent adversary of the Bishop of Kingston, had heard nothing at all about it until the 17th instant, when he chanced to see a copy of the Gazette.

In conclusion let me say this other word. To persons unacquainted with the vexatious proceedings of the Public School Board of Kingston, His Lordship's censures may appear unnecessarily severe; but when a paper's zeal is aroused by a violent assault made upon the young ones of his congregation, and he has the courage to meet the enemy face to face in open fight, it is not surprising that he should strike sturdy blows, more especially if the weapons of misrepresentation and calumny have been freely employed against him.

I am, dear sir, yours faithfully, J. H. McDONAGH, priest, Pastor of Napanee, Ont.

THE BISHOP AT BROCKVILLE.

On Sunday His Lordship Bishop Cleary addressed the Roman Catholic congregation of Brockville, and the following report of his remarks is taken from the Recorder:— Referring to the Napanee question, the Bishop said he was pained to the heart by the action of so large a number of journals in publishing that anonymous libel. He said he had grave cause of complaint against those who unwarrantably accepted such odious imputations against him and wrote fierce editorial articles denouncing him without any warrant except a nameless and nameless libel written in a manifestly hostile spirit. His action in defence of the little Catholic children when the public school board of Kingston had sought to stigmatize before the world by branding them as "expelled" pupils, although uncondemned of any crime and unacquainted with his obvious duty as the children's pastor. The subsequent withdrawal of all the children of Catholic parents and of some Protestant fathers likewise, from the public schools of Kingston, was the result of the board's oral proceeding. It is to avenge this upon the Bishop that the anonymous libel was concocted two days after he (the Bishop) had announced this result in a pastoral letter to his congregation last Sunday. The address was delivered by him in Napanee on November 2nd. On the 4th November the journals published reports of his instructions during the visitation, and found no fault with them, but rather praised them. The Toronto Mail's own correspondent in Napanee sent a report to that journal which the editor's remarks would signify not to have contained any great accusation. But now, thirteen days after the Bishop's delivery of that address, and two days after the issue of his pastoral letter in the church concerning the withdrawal of all the Catholic children from the public schools, the "conscience" of the Board's ill-treatment of them, an anonymous

report of his address is prepared by angry men, sent round to all the journals for publication, and comments of denunciation against the Bishop. In the anonymous document itself the Bishop is charged with imputing immodesty to all the women and girls of Canada, and some of the editorial articles emphasize this yet more unjustly by interpreting it direct against the "wives and mothers of Canada." He (the Bishop) protested against all this as untrue and gravely unjust. He did not speak at all of women, much less of wives and mothers, but addressed himself solely to the manners of young people, telling how they should be formed on the Christian type, and particularly in regard of females, and complaining of the neglect of this important element in the public education of this country. He had mentioned certain irregularities of manner that are too frequently observable in the youth of this country, such as loudness of speech in the railway cars, staring fixedly at persons of the opposite sex, and other forms of unreserve in deportment which had sometimes come under his own notice and he had heard others remark upon, and he argued that these were indications of a defective system of training in the public institution. He said it was wholly untrue that he had attributed those irregularities to all the young females of Canada; he spoke only of instances that were frequently visible to every traveller. It is shamefully untrue that he imputed immodesty or immorality to any of them. When he used the word modest in that address at Napanee, it was always in reference to deportment and the forms of outward manner, and everyone knows that in this connection the word has a definite signification, and that to torture such a phrase into a charge of immodesty or immorality, as some of the journals have done, is a gross injustice and calumny. He said, in conclusion, that it is quite usual to enforce the necessity of general regulations, whether demanded of Government or of educational institutions, by reference to instances of irregularity, and that no one interprets such reference as a charge against the entire community. Thus the cause of temperance is every day advocated by arguments and maxims relating to well known instances of intemperance in this or that city or district, and no one thinks of charging the speakers with vilifying the whole body of the inhabitants in such cities, towns and districts as drunkards. The treatment he (the Bishop) had received from the press and the publication of the anonymous libel and their unjust comments extending his words beyond their scope and meaning, had caused him great pain, and this had come upon him at a time when he is suffering from physical exhaustion after a laborious visitation of his diocese begun at the end of May and continued up to the present week. Instead of the needful rest which he was preparing to take after so much toil, he finds himself burdened with this new and most painful load of anxiety and distress.

ARBITRATION.

A SCENE IN NEW JERSEY—EDITORS TO BE PROSECUTED IN IRELAND.

CAMDEN, Nov. 29.—A remarkable scene occurred last night at a meeting which was gotten up in the interest of the four members of the British Parliament who are advocating the peace arbitration idea. Before the meeting had proceeded far it was very apparent that two-thirds of those present were Irish sympathizers, and when the usual resolutions were read, the following was offered as an additional resolution and adopted along with the others:—

Resolved, that we earnestly urge that the principles of arbitration be adopted by England in the settlement of the difficulties between that country and down-trodden Ireland, believing as we do that the method will result in a speedy correction of shameful abuses that are being heaped upon defenceless Irish tenants under cover of the iniquitous coercion law.

TO BE PROSECUTED.

DUBLIN, Nov. 28.—After the trial of Lord Mayor Sullivan, editor of the Nation, for printing reports of meetings of suppressed branches of the National League, the Government will prosecute a number of editors of other papers for publishing similar reports.

DILLON AT OXFORD.

LONDON, Nov. 28.—On the invitation of the Oxford University Russell Club, John Dillon, M.P., to-day delivered an address in the Corn Exchange. He reviewed the history of Ireland, and said that agitation in that country was justifiable. Without agitation the Irish would not have obtained the land acts. It was a lasting honor to the Irish that they had refused to submit tamely to the detestable Castle Government. John Dillon writes that it is owing to his urgent request that Messrs. Cox and Sheehy, members of Parliament, have evaded arrest since the warrants were issued against them. He says both of these gentlemen have given valuable assistance in combining the tenants to demand reduced rents.

The Freeman's Journal asserts that the arrest of news agents for selling copies of United Ireland is illegal. If it is legal, it says, the Dublin depot of the Right Hon. Wm. Henry Smith's News Company are guilty of the same offence, as they have sold thousands of United Irelands. The Freeman's Journal declares that the coming of Mr. Mandeville to a stinking cell at Kilmacore prison for refusing to cleanse utensils and exercise in company with ordinary criminals is as scandalous as the worst outrages committed in Bombay or Neapolitan prisons.

A WORD FROM DILLON.

DUBLIN, Nov. 28.—John Dillon writes that it is owing to his urgent request that Messrs. Cox and Sheehy, members of Parliament, have evaded arrest since the warrants were issued for them; he says both of these gentlemen have given valuable assistance in combining the tenants to demand reduced rents.

WHAT HAS THE UNION DONE FOR IRELAND?

LETTER I.

That the means resorted to by Mr. Pitt, through Lord Castlereagh, for the gaining over the majority of the Irish Parliament, exhibited corruption in its most gigantic and revolting form, is less disgraceful to those Ministers than the parties on whose venality they relied. Ireland was bought wholesale by England; but it was her own children who sold her. —Times Newspaper, Jan. 8, 1851.

To the Editor of THE POST AND TRUE WITNESS.

SIR,—The above quotation is a decided opinion on a question which now engrosses every thinking man in the British Empire, to the exclusion of almost every other subject. Compared with the question of Home Rule, every other matter of public interest sinks into insignificance. It is a subject of discussion everywhere, and with every one; in the humble hamlet of the half-starved peasant, as well as in the proud mansion of the wealthy peer. The violent attempts made to prevent its discussion, the gagging of the Press, the imprisonment of the people's representatives, the abhorrent work of the "Crowbar brigade," the infamies of the detested emergency men, the refined cruelties of the landlord class, instead of throwing it back, have propelled it in an extraordinary degree. The over-zealous efforts of those who are vainly attempting to stifle public opinion are doing more to promote the question of Home Rule than its most strenuous supporters—it is now floating on the tide of public opinion; it is an uppermost and foremost of the democratic platform of Great Britain; its course is steadily towards the polar star; it cannot be resisted. The opinions expressed by the so-called Unionists, and by the famous perverters of history, Smith and Froude, and the great scientist Tyndal, have naturally caused much discussion with both Tories and Liberals; they have been the cause of regret and disappointment, if not deep displeasure, to many of their ardent, disinterested, and zealous friends. Some of these men were once found on the side of every liberal and enlightened measure—enemies to oppression at home, and the advocates of liberty abroad. Of James Anthony Froude, the impaled, lying historian, it is unnecessary to say much—his advice in to-day's telegrams, for the application of perpetual martial law to Ireland, will meet with the same contempt and derision from all unprejudiced people as did his historical eulogies on Henry VIII. and his virtuous daughter, "good queen Bess." I shall not take up the public attention of these gentlemen for the present; suffice it, my opinions are in opposition to theirs, on one of the greatest political questions of the age—a question deeply involving the life, liberty, property and happiness of the people of Ireland. It is my intention to enter into a full discussion of this momentous question;—but before I attempt to reply to arguments, I think it necessary to make a few preliminary observations, which will explain the principles on which I mean to proceed, the object I have in view, and the motives which have influenced me in thus taking on myself a duty which I feel myself not sufficiently adequate to perform. The first subject that presses itself on my consideration is the means resorted to, by Her Majesty's Government in Ireland, to prevent lawful meetings, free discussion, and to stifle public opinion. In common with every man who knows and values the free principles of the British Constitution, I have to condemn, in the strongest manner, the advisers of her Majesty's Representative in Ireland (although, God knows, he is by nature as bad as the worst), for the usual for an unbecoming exercise of a law unknown to the Constitution. As a British subject, entitled to the protection of British laws, I would feel it a degradation to set my foot in a country where such power is tolerated. In these arbitrary proceedings, I see one law for Ireland and another law for England. This unalloyed exercise of authority looks more like the angry visitation of offended power than the mild dispensation of the laws of Victoria, who completed her Jubilee a few months since,—a power much more consonant to that delegated to a Persian Satrap or a Turkish Bashaw than that which ought only to be placed in the hands of a British Peer by a British Queen. What adds not a little to this ill-advised inroad on the constitutional rights and constitutional feelings of the Irish people is, that these extreme measures should be sanctioned by the present Ministers—men who, before they attained power, were the most violent advocates of the constitutional rights of the people, and who still pretend to be so for every other people on earth, save the Irish. If Irishmen only exercise the right of all freemen, that of speaking and thinking, to the Constitution is suspended, Dublin Castle cries "Havoc! and let slip the dogs of war" upon the peaceable, wretched inhabitants of that unhappy country. Balfour grasps his thunder—But Jupiter is always wrong when he appeals to his thunder. He flings his sword and buckler into the scale, as if seven centuries of English misrule, injuries and wrongs were not enough to convince unhappy Ireland that there was nothing but war for the conquered. If the Government was not convinced that the question of Home Rule would be forwarded by discussion, and that it was capable of being supported by unassailable argument, they would not resort to their "thunder," bayonets and brutality to put it down. Another ally, resorted to by Randy Churchhill, Joe Chamberlain & Co., Religious Bigotry, has been called on to aid the Government Proclamations. I cannot think that all her Majesty's advisers could be wicked enough to call for aid on so frightful an auxiliary; however, a bold attempt has been made to raise the war-whoop of religious feud. If I raise the war-whoop of religious feud, I thought the violence of one party to prevent, or the over-zealous efforts of the other to promote, Home Rule, would have the effect of again raising the demon of religious discord; I would say that the time for discussion had not arrived—that the people were not prepared for it—that it should be postponed; but the present attempt is as weak as it is wicked; the distinctions of Orange

man and Papist no longer exist in Ireland—they will no longer allow themselves to be used as puppets by the jugglers behind the scenes, to perpetrate the degradation of their common country; they know that the interest of the Orange merchant, manufacturer, and tradesman, is the same with that of the Catholic People—the prosperity of the one must, as a natural consequence, lead to the prosperity of the other. With such knowledge abroad, and who to-day can doubt it, the attempt to light up the torch of religious discord, to raise the war-whoop of religious bigotry, must be vain and fruitless. The ultra Orangeman and the ultra Papist must pair off together—they are twin brothers—they should never be separated: let them bow to the moloch of despotism; the Protestant people and the Catholic people will unite in the glorious cause of their country's and constitutional liberty. The trick is too stale—it can only impose on the ignorant, the bigoted, and the besotted. The enlightened spirits of the age has shone upon the dark and wicked deeds of the false magicians; their spell is broken—their wand is shattered to atoms—the greatest curse that possibly can fall on any nation or people, the curse of religious dissensions, can never again be inflicted on the Irish.

Having said so much on the subject of the proclamations, and the attempt at raising the cry of religious discord, two subjects that deserve to be placed together—civil and religious bigotry—

"Sure such a pair was never seen,
So justly form'd to meet by nature."

I shall in a few words advert to another bugbear that has been insidiously raised to frighten the people from entering into the discussion on Home Rule—namely, the danger of separation from England. On the important point I am most anxious not to be misunderstood. The opponents of Home Rule and her Majesty's Ministers charge those who support it with nothing more or less than the dismemberment of the Empire. The advocates of Home Rule—and they number the democracy of the world—fling back with contempt in the face of their accusers the unfounded charge, and reply, that their object is a modified repeal of the existing Union, only to form another, on a more equitable basis, which will make the Union indissoluble. They are advocates on these political lines from an honest conviction, that as surely as efforts follow causes, the present unhappy state of Ireland—unless Home Rule is granted—must inevitably bring about that separation which they are charged with endeavoring to accomplish. They say that a union of the two countries on the basis of reciprocity and mutual advantage would promote the power and liberty of both; that the present has not one distinguishing feature of such a union; that it paralyzes instead of strengthening the Government; that the vast population, discontented and disorganized, suffering the extreme of human misery, goaded out of patience by wicked laws subjected to the tyranny of robber landlords, thrown into dungeons for no offence, cannot much longer remain in their present state without causing some violent shock to the Empire. Home Rule, declares the advocates, is the only panacea for all the existing evils, while the Tory-Unionists welcome the dismemberment rather than grant the only measure calculated to cement an indissoluble Union between the two countries. An impassable barrier is thrown between the higher and the lower classes; no sympathy exists between them. There is no connecting link in the state of Irish society; the relations of landlord and tenant, of master and servant, cannot be said to exist. It is divided between the few, who are determined to cling to their monopolies to the last—and the many, who are determined to shake them off when they can. Amidst the conflict of opinion, the people have no confidence in the Government, which ought to be the impartial arbitrator between them. Every day's experience proves to them that their representative influence is null; that the monopolists of everything else in Ireland have also monopolized the favor of the Government; and the natural consequence is, that Irish society exhibits one mighty mass of dissatisfaction and discontent. The advocates of Home Rule say that it is only a local Legislature, which will gain the confidence of the people, that possibly can calm the stormy waves of public agitation; that the time has arrived to open the contract between the two countries—to examine whether it has been formed on just principles—whether another could not be entered into that would give more satisfaction—whether a Union could not be formed that would bind the countries in one common body, add to the power and glory of the Empire, and secure its internal property and happiness. To prove this is the object I have in view in putting myself forward on the present occasion, like a Knight Errant of old, to sliver a lance with my masters in politics, and my superiors in everything else,—except truth!

I shall divide their arguments. They state, firstly—that Home Rule is only a fictitious name for Repeal of the Act of Union, and would be attended with consequences the most deplorable to Ireland, and that it was the opinion of Grattan and other eminent men, and of course their own, that the Union, once carried, was irrevocable and its repeal impracticable. Secondly—that the present evils of Ireland are not to be attributed to the Union, nor to the Government's monopoly of the Irish Parliament before the Union. Thirdly—they claim one part of the Imperial Parliament credit for conferring vast benefits upon Ireland; and some of them make particular claim for the boon conferred upon her by the Corn Intercourse Bill of 1806.

[Continued on 8th page.]

TENANTS REJOICE.

DUBLIN, Nov. 28.—One hundred and thirty Gweedore tenants have been restituted, and their arrears of rent have been reduced £2,500. There is great rejoicing among the tenantry.

CATHOLIC NEWS.

The salvation of one soul is of more value than the conquest of an empire.—De Champlain.

Humility is a fortified town. It repels all attacks. The sight of it obliges the enemy to turn and flee.

In mortal sin it would be better to receive legions of devils than once to receive the living and terrible God.

The more humanity you show in receiving correction, the more mercy God will show you in pardoning your sins.

If I should see a priest and an angel coming the same road I should hasten to kiss the priest first.—St. Francis de Sales.

Of all the riches that we hug, of all the pleasures we enjoy, we may carry no more out of this world than out of a dream.

Send your goods on before you to Heaven, where you shall shortly be, and shall enjoy them with interest.—Sir Thomas More.

Humility is the shortest, straightest, surest road by which to arrive, without difficulty, to the love of God and the perfection of every virtue.

Penance is a means, not the end of the soul; be careful not to measure perfection by penitential works; virtue and merit lie in charity.

If you've got a man's heart and soul in you, you can't be any amassing your own bed, and leaving the rest to lie on the stones.—George Eliot.

Shun the world for it will deceive you; for happiness it will give you disappointment; for honor, shame; for fidelity, misery for riches, and eternal death for everlasting life.

Remember that virtue is a very high and rugged mountain, difficult to ascend and requiring much sweat and fatigue before we can arrive at the summit to rest.—B. Henry Stue.

Happy is he who has charity for every one, and who does not desire, moreover, that they have charity for him; and happy too, is he who performs great charity for his neighbor, yet does not trouble himself about receiving like service in return.

It is an awful thing for one to throw away his life on earth, either making it of no real value, or by making it a curse to others. He who does this in either way is sure to make life a total failure for eternity. Good were it for such a man if he had never been born.

Depend upon it, in the midst of all the science about the world and its ways, and all the ignorance of God and His greatness, the man or woman who can say "Thy will be done" with the true heart of giving up, is nearer the secret of things than the geologist or theologian.—George MacDonald.

Life is not all in getting, but quite as much in helping. Property is not an absolute possession, to be used or abused at will, but a responsible trust. Labor is not genuine that has no heart or conscience in it. The mutual obligations of men are not discharged when they have performed their tasks and paid the stipulated price.

It is an old Hindoo saying that "the mind is the subtlest of poisons," and it needs the antidotes of cheerful, deliberately accepted work, and a resolute ignoring of mere feeling. Hard? Nothing is harder, but nothing more certain of success. What was that bit we read yesterday? It is the whole story. "Thou hast but to resolve, and lo, God's great universe shall fortify thy soul."—Helen Campbell.

The cup that is full of precious wine has no room for the weakening water. So the heart that is full of the precious wine of God's love has no room for hate and the weakening water of worldliness; the life that is full of deeds of good has no room for the efforts of evil; the heart that is full of cheer has no room for aching sorrow; the mouth that is full of blessings has no room for bitter cursing; the heart brimming over with good is free from power of evil.

Devotion to the Sacred Heart of Mary must be ranked among those of comparatively recent origin. Mary's acceptance of the dignity of Mother of God, Her visit to St. Elizabeth, the presentation of the Holy Child in the Temple, the sorrowful seeking of Him in the precincts of the same Temple, with all the sorrowful Mysteries of the Rosary, are so many recollections of that admirable Heart. Whatever awaken in the Christian a greater love of Mary and devotion to Her, unkindles a greater veneration for Her maternal Heart, and as the former is the object of the Rosary, the latter is the result of its pious recitation.

PAPAL BRIEF.

By a brief dated the first day of October, the Holy Father grants a plenary indulgence to all who shall visit Rome during the celebration of his sacerdotal jubilee in order to bear public witness to the piety and devotion of their own people, and to render honor and due obedience to the supreme authority vested in the Sovereign Pontiff. The same favor is also extended to those who unite themselves in spirit to such pious pilgrimages; or who in any way whatever promote their success. The conditions are that a novena be made and the third part of the Holy Rosary recited daily before the first day of January. If the novena is repeated during the time fixed for the public audiences, a plenary indulgence, on the usual conditions, may be gained on the day of the jubilee and on the feast that immediately follows the novena. Furthermore, His Holiness remits to all who with contrite hearts make such novenas, for each day, 300 hundred days of penance that they may have in any way incurred; or that may be due from them. All these indulgences, etc., are applicable to the souls in purgatory.

PROTEST AGAINST O'BRIEN'S TREATMENT.

DUBLIN, Nov. 25.—A "crowded" meeting was held here yesterday to protest against the treatment of Mr. O'Brien by the Tullamore jail authorities. Lord Mayor Sullivan acted as chairman, and seven English members of the House of Commons were present.