

Irishman is still more profoundly Irish, but it does not follow that because his local patriotism is strong he should be incapable of an Imperial patriotism. There are two modes of presenting the subject which I have argued. One of them is the present which we now recommend as good, and the other is to present it as a choice of evils and the least among the varied evils with which as a possibility we are confronted. Well, I have argued the matter as if I had been

A CHOICE OF EVILS. I have recognized as facts and as entitled to attention jealousies which I myself do not share or feel. I have argued it on that ground as the only ground on which it can be recommended, not only to a mixed auditory, but to the public mind of the country that cannot give minute investigation to all portions of this complicated question. I do not know whether it may appear too bold, but in my own heart I cherish the hope that this is not merely a choice of the lesser evil, but that it may be proved to be ere long

A GOOD IN ITSELF. (Loud cheers.) There is, I know, an answer to this, and what is the answer? The answer is only found in the view which rests upon a basis of despair, of absolute condemnation of Ireland and Irishmen as exceptions to those beneficial provisions which have made, in general Europeans, in particular Englishmen and Americans, capable of self-government; that an Irishman is a *lusus nature*; that justice, common sense, moderation.

NATURAL PROSPERITY. have no meaning for him; that all that he can understand and all that he can apprehend is strife, perpetual dissension. Now, Sir, I am not going to argue in this House whether this view, this monstrous view—(Irish cheers)—is a correct one, I say the Irishman is as capable of loyalty as another man—(renewed Irish cheers)—but if his loyalty has been checked, why it is because the laws by which he is governed do not present themselves to him as they do to us in England or Scotland with a native and

CONGENIAL ELEMENT. I have no right to say that Ireland through her constitutionally elected members will accept the measure I propose. I hope they will, but I have no right to assume it; nor have I any power to enforce it upon the people of England and Scotland, but I rely on the patriotism and the sagacity of this House: on a

FREE AND FULL DISCUSSION, and, more than all upon the just and generous sentiments of the two British nations. And, looking forward, I ask the House, believing that no trivial motive could have driven us to assist in the work we have undertaken (work which we believe will restore Parliament to its free and unimpeded course)—I ask them to stay the

WASTE OF THE PUBLIC TREASURE under the present system of government and administration in Ireland, which is not waste only, but waste which demoralizes while it exhausts—I ask them to show to Europe and America that we, too, can face the political problems which America had to face twenty years ago, and which many countries in Europe have been called on to face, and have not feared to deal with. I ask that we shall practice as we have very often preached, and that in our own case should

BE FIRM AND FEARLESS in applying the doctrine we have often inculcated on others, that the concession of local self-government is not the way to sap and impair, but to strengthen and consolidate unity. I ask that we should learn to rely less on mere written stipulations and more on those better stipulations written on the heart and mind of man. I ask that we should apply to Ireland the happy experience we have gained in England and Scotland, where a course of generations has now taught us, not as a dream or a theory, but as a matter of practice and of life, that the best and surest foundation we can find to build on is the foundation afforded by the affections and convictions and will of man, and that it is thus by the decree of the Almighty that, far more than by any other method, we may be enabled to secure at once the social happiness, the power, and the permanence of the Empire.

Such is Mr. Gladstone's plan for the restoration of Ireland's legislative independence, and the removal of her long-standing grievances, a plan not indeed without defects, but a plan, with all its shortcomings, broad, original, honest and comprehensive. Critics are now busy studying and condemning it in detail, but the structure of Mr. Gladstone's genius and statesmanship will survive their petty assaults and their impotent animadversions. By the removal of redundancies here and there, and the better adjustment of its parts, this grand edifice of constitutional reform will settle, solidify, and endure. On one point we wish to place ourselves on record, however much as we may in this regard differ from profound jurists and eminent churchmen. We hold that that which some point out as the radical defect of the Gladstonian Irish constitution, namely, the removal of Irish representation from Westminster, is really its radical strength. The Parliament of Ireland, as proposed by Mr. Gladstone, will be in many respects an imperial Parliament, co-ordinate as a Parliament with the Parliament of Great Britain. Given Irish representation at Westminster, and the Irish Parliament sinks to the level of a state or provincial assembly, without the power or the prestige of an imperial legislature. Furthermore, the presence of an Irish delegation at Westminster could not, in our view, fail to excite contention and conflict as to the rights and jurisdiction of the two Parliaments respectively. An Irish Parliament without Irish representation at Westminster secures for Ireland legislative independence without national inferiority. It secures for Ireland full and total control of Irish affairs, without the interference or predominance of an alien Parliament even in

shadow or in potency. But what, we may be asked, will become of the English Catholics without Irish representation at Westminster? To English Catholics, not of Irish extraction, as a body, the Irish people owe nothing. Many noble exceptions to English Catholic ingratitude and injustice to Ireland there are, we gladly admit, but the English Catholics as a whole have been among Ireland's worst and most inveterate foes. It was Ireland who lifted them up from the mire of social degradation, and they reviled her; Ireland who gave them liberty of conscience, and they denounced her; Ireland who restored them their hierarchy by giving them a laity, and they laughed her to scorn. Irish and English Catholics have politically reached the parting of the ways. Irish Catholics have decided on their way, let the English Catholics go as they will. In any case in a Parliament largely Catholic, sitting in Dublin, the Catholic minority of Great Britain would have, should ever a struggle again arise for freedom of conscience in the British Isles, better protection than from a fragmentary and impotent representation at Westminster. Upon no prophecy concerning the Parliamentary fate of Mr. Gladstone's measure will we venture. But we will say "that the time is at hand, the spirit is gone forth, the declaration is planted; and though great men should apostatize, yet the cause will live, and though the public speaker should die, yet the immortal fire shall outlast the organ which conveyed it, and the breath of liberty, like the word of the holy man, will not die with the prophet, but survive him." Yes, we have faith, strong and abiding faith in the future. We believe that the sun of Ireland's freedom has risen in auroral splendor, never again to be clouded by sorrow or adversity. The nations already welcome their long lost sister to their bosom, wipe away her tears and bid her rejoice and be merry. Mr. Gladstone must indeed be nerved, inspirited and strengthened in his purpose to fight the battle of Ireland's freedom, by the enthusiastic support of free and civilized men throughout the world. When that fight is fought and won—fought and won as it must be—and the Irish nation led to victory, then may Charles Stewart Parnell, the Grattan of these later days, through whose skill and foresight and determination, as his people's leader, English statesmanship has been forced to this step—address his emancipated country: "I found Ireland on her knees, I watched over her with a paternal solicitude; I have traced her progress from long endured injuries to constitutional resistance, and from resistance to liberty. Spirit of Swift! spirit of Molyneux! spirit of Grattan! spirit of O'Connell! your genius has prevailed! Ireland is now a nation! In that new character I hail her! and bowing to her august presence, I say, *Eto pæperua*."

THE QUEBEC POST OFFICE INSPECTORSHIP. The Post office Inspectorship of the Quebec district is vacant, owing to the death of Mr. Sheppard, late Inspector. It is rumored that the post will be given to Mr. Bolduc, Assistant Inspector for the Ottawa district. The Assistant Inspector of the Montreal district, Mr. Neilgan, (an Irishman) is the *oldet* (in office) of the Assistant Inspectors in Canada. Why is not he promoted? Mr. Bolduc has been only about seven years *alloger*, in the civil service—three only as Assistant Inspector. Why must he be promoted over the head of Mr. Neilgan? Is it because his brother, Senator Bolduc, refused to join the "Bollers," and has fallen into line with the Government; and actually seconded the address in the Senate? Did the Government secure his alliance by promising this appointment to his brother, whose promotion should not come for years yet? What does Mr. Costigan say to this? What does Mr. Curran say? This is Mr. McGreevy's? The latter, or the two latter, particularly, should not allow their countryman to be set aside, to lose his *just rights*. In a word, is the matter one of bargain and sale between Senator Bolduc and the government; and must right give way in this case? We have no objection to Mr. Bolduc on the grounds of nationality or fitness. The French Canadian no more than the Irish Catholic has had his just share of the public appointments, particularly in the Post Office department. But the Irish in every department, but especially in that, not having the Parliamentary strength of their French brethren, have been made victims of official exclusiveness to an extent that can hardly be realized. We hope that the filling of this Inspectorship will not be another instance of the maxim so often inculcated and so often acted on in Ottawa by ministers of Sir A. Campbell's ilk, "No Irish need apply."

If there are any Catholics in the organization known as the Knights of Labor in this city, they must have been mortified by the order issued in Saturday's daily papers calling upon all the members of that body to attend a course of sermons on Sunday evenings by the Rev. Mr. Hunter in the Dundas street Congregational Church.

CHATHAM'S NEW CHURCH.

We feel genuine pleasure in informing our readers that the flourishing town of Chatham, in the Diocese of London, is Irish people owe nothing. Many noble exceptions to English Catholic ingratitude and injustice to Ireland there are, we gladly admit, but the English Catholics as a whole have been among Ireland's worst and most inveterate foes. It was Ireland who lifted them up from the mire of social degradation, and they reviled her; Ireland who gave them liberty of conscience, and they denounced her; Ireland who restored them their hierarchy by giving them a laity, and they laughed her to scorn. Irish and English Catholics have politically reached the parting of the ways. Irish Catholics have decided on their way, let the English Catholics go as they will. In any case in a Parliament largely Catholic, sitting in Dublin, the Catholic minority of Great Britain would have, should ever a struggle again arise for freedom of conscience in the British Isles, better protection than from a fragmentary and impotent representation at Westminster. Upon no prophecy concerning the Parliamentary fate of Mr. Gladstone's measure will we venture. But we will say "that the time is at hand, the spirit is gone forth, the declaration is planted; and though great men should apostatize, yet the cause will live, and though the public speaker should die, yet the immortal fire shall outlast the organ which conveyed it, and the breath of liberty, like the word of the holy man, will not die with the prophet, but survive him." Yes, we have faith, strong and abiding faith in the future. We believe that the sun of Ireland's freedom has risen in auroral splendor, never again to be clouded by sorrow or adversity. The nations already welcome their long lost sister to their bosom, wipe away her tears and bid her rejoice and be merry. Mr. Gladstone must indeed be nerved, inspirited and strengthened in his purpose to fight the battle of Ireland's freedom, by the enthusiastic support of free and civilized men throughout the world. When that fight is fought and won—fought and won as it must be—and the Irish nation led to victory, then may Charles Stewart Parnell, the Grattan of these later days, through whose skill and foresight and determination, as his people's leader, English statesmanship has been forced to this step—address his emancipated country: "I found Ireland on her knees, I watched over her with a paternal solicitude; I have traced her progress from long endured injuries to constitutional resistance, and from resistance to liberty. Spirit of Swift! spirit of Molyneux! spirit of Grattan! spirit of O'Connell! your genius has prevailed! Ireland is now a nation! In that new character I hail her! and bowing to her august presence, I say, *Eto pæperua*."

LETTER FROM MR. CURRAN, M. P.

We have received from the member for Montreal Centre a letter that we gladly lay before our readers:

Ottawa, 5th April, 1886. To the Editor of the Catholic Record. REV. AND DEAR SIR,—In your last issue I perceive you call into question my statement that "the test of the fairness of a trial is its legality." I said further and you quoted my words:

"What is the test of fairness? The only test of fairness is that which is established by law; you cannot go beyond that; the judge cannot go beyond the law, and if a man has had the full benefit of the law—for the law as it stands on the statute book is the test of fairness—he has had a fair trial."

My statement must have been very startling to you since it called forth the following:

"This from an Irish Catholic gentleman is an extraordinary statement. Does not Mr. Curran know that the history of Ireland is darkened with the record of trials legal but not fair?"

I am under the impression that I do know something of the history of Ireland and more especially of the trials to which you refer. I learn for the first time, however, that the trials in question were legal. I have always believed them to have been unfair and something more simply because they were not legal. They were tragic farces each of them, a "mockery, a delusion and a snare." Had these trials been legal there would have been an impartial judge, no paid informers, no foregone verdict and sentence. All these things existed, however, and save that those trials were held in a court room there was no semblance of legality about them. The law was trampled upon from their inception to their close. The prisoners were not tried according to law and were therefore unfairly tried. You find my statement extraordinary. Allow me to express my astonishment that you should have declared these trials referred to legal.

As regards the trial at Regina the question of fairness is no longer in issue. That has been settled beyond cavil. Your obedient servant, J. J. CURRAN.

In reply to the hon. gentleman we beg to point out that to our mind we are simply not agreed in the definition of the term legal. Mr. Curran holds that when the judge is just, the jury fairly selected and composed of honest, impartial men, the evidence free from falsehood and the law under which the trial takes place just, the trial must be fair. So do we. But we do hold also that in cases where the judge is unjust, the jury unfairly selected, or biased by prejudice, and the evidence questionable, all the forms of a just law may be literally observed, and the trial, while legal as to form, quite unfair and unjust in its result. We hold, further, that trials held under unjust laws, the existence of which the hon. gentleman seems to ignore, may be, and often have been, legal as to form and in strict conformity with the letter of those laws, but yet very unjust. In a word, to our mind legality is not always a test of fairness. De Ferriere, in his *Dictionnaire de Droit et de Pratique*, defines the term "legal" as follows:

"Legal se dit de ce qui est défini par les Lois—ainsi on appelle peines legales celles que les Lois ont définies pour tels crimes a la différence des peines arbitraires, qui dependent de l'opinion des juges." "Legal is said of that which is prescribed by the laws. Thus we term legal penalties those which the laws have prescribed for certain crimes, in distinction from arbitrary penalties which depend on the opinion of the judges." As to the existence of unjust laws, we refer to the hon. gentleman to St. Thomas

Aquinas: *Tractatus de exterioribus principibus actuum Humanorum; de Legibus; Articulus Quatuor; Utrum lex humana imponat homini necessitatem in foro conscientie?* "Are human laws," asks the Angelic doctor, "binding in the tribunal of human conscience?" In his answer in the affirmative, in so far as these laws are just, he says that laws are unjust in two ways: (1) when they injure human weal by reason of their bearing qualifications opposed to those of just laws; (2) when they are contrary to the divine good, such as the laws of tyrants commanding idolatry and the like. The Angelic doctor says that those laws that are contrary to the commandments of God—and beyond the power of the law makers, are not to be obeyed. As to oppressive laws that impose unjust burdens upon subjects, they are also beyond the power conferred by Almighty God and are not to be obeyed, unless resistance would induce scandal or still greater evils. We give the very words of the Angelic doctor. In reply to the question above given he says:

Respondet dicendum, quod leges positae humanitas, sunt iustae vel iniustae. Si quidem iustae sunt, habent vim obligandi in foro conscientiae a lege aeterna, a qua derivatur, secundum illud *Prover. VIII*: "Per me reges regnant, et legum conditores iustae decernunt." Injustae autem sunt leges dupliciter. Uno modo per contrarietatem ad bonum humanum et contrarium practicum; vel ex fine, sicut cum aliquis president leges imponit onerosas subditis, non pertinentes ad utilitatem communiem, sed magis ad propriam cupiditatem vel gloriam; vel etiam ex auctoritate, sicut cum aliquis fert legem ultra sibi commissam potestatem; vel etiam ex forma, puta cum ille qui legem multatodina dispensatur, etiam ordinatur ad bonum commune. Alio modo leges possunt esse iniustae per contrarietatem ad bonum divinum, sicut leges tyrannorum inducentes ad idololatram vel ad quodcumque aliud quod sit contra legem divinam: et tales leges nullo modo licet observare, quia sicut dicitur *Acto. IV*, "obediendum oportet Deo magis quam hominibus."

The hon. gentleman tells us, rather in tones of anticipated triumph, that he is surprised that we should have declared certain celebrated Irish trials legal. We answer that many of them were legal in the sense already given, viz, that the letter and the spirit of unjust laws were in those instances observed and carried out. He knows that the statute book of Ireland, for two centuries at least, was blackened by laws, infamously unjust and rigidly enforced, and he must know too that the Irish tyrants and persecutors of old were in many cases careful in the observance of the forms of the law, such as it stood. Had Mr. Curran in his speech defined his view of a legal trial as one with an impartial judge, no paid jury, no paid informers or perjured witnesses, no foregone verdict and sentence, we should never have questioned his use of the word in making legality the test of the fairness of a trial. He was not precise in his definition of the term. How many trials even in this country have there not been wherein these conditions have been at least in part wanting? Quite recently we cited one ourselves, whose memory will never die out.

HE MARRIED NEITHER.

The public had just begun to recover from the amusement created by Rev. Mr. Henderson's cigar-stub census, whereof he reported progress at the newboys' dinner, when the London *Advertiser* of Saturday came forward with the following rich contribution to public enjoyment:

"Once I was stopping with a family. There were daughters in that family. I saw a beggar turned away hungry from the door of the house in which they lived. I knew the daughters in that household particularly wanted to be married to ministers, but I did not marry either of them," said Mr. Hunter last night at the evangelistic services in the Wellington Street Methodist Church before an audience which packed the building to the doors."

No one who knows the rev. gentleman's keenness of appreciation of the eternal fitness of things—no one who can understand his love of the good, the true and the beautiful—no one who can ascend to the height of his aestheticism—would for one moment believe that Mr. Hunter would or could or ever should stay at any house other than one where there were daughters. The rev. gentleman believes, no doubt, in the evangelical dictum, "Blessed are they that mourn"—but only because it is added thereto, "for they shall be comforted." He had had, there is no room for question, in the dismal days of his bachelorhood, many occasions to mourn, and therefore, like other men similarly afflicted, sought comfort in the society of the daughters of Israel. With the rev. gentleman we do not, on this account, venture to find fault, but we do think that he was rather unjust to himself and unkind to his audience on Friday evening in not favoring them with a bill of particulars concerning the unfortunate daughters of whom he married neither. He told not his hearers what, if any, were the attractions or qualifications for matrimony in these fair ones—he mentioned not that he had perchance proposed to and been refused by both—he took not the people into his confidence to such an extent as to say whether the beggar he

alludes to was not a suitor for the fair maids in question—a rival seeking to outwit him in his evangelical simplicity. "Begger" is at best but a dubious expression. Mr. Hunter's declaration of Friday was, on the whole, more remarkable for omission than for admission. We shall be glad to hear from him fully on the subject, as will, we know, the entire city of London. Meantime Mr. Henderson has lost his place at the head of the ministerial class.

NATIONAL AUTONOMY.

In our esteemed French contemporary, *L'Etandard*, under date the 10th inst., appeared a very remarkable article on the political situation as affected by Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule scheme. Our contemporary says: On Thursday, the 8th of April, a date that should be forever memorialized in the history of Ireland, we saw the Prime Minister of Britain's mighty empire come down himself to Parliament with an important measure consecrating the political, legislative, administrative and judicial autonomy of Ireland, and proclaiming solemnly as true, as legitimate and as sacred the august principle of national autonomy. Our contemporary further says: In our turn we may say to those who put British loyalty in the annihilation of French Canada: Do you believe that because we wish to remain French Canadians, we cannot be at the same time good citizens of Canada, and faithful subjects of Britain?

EDITORIAL NOTES.

A MONTH'S Mind service for the repose of the soul of the late Rev. Father Carlin, was celebrated at Irish town on Tuesday, the 13th inst.

THE Orangemen of Armagh have already held a demonstration and passed resolutions against Mr. Gladstone's proposals. So much the better for the proposals.

His Lordship the Bishop of London completed on Sunday last a course of sermons, begun on the Sunday before Lent, and continued uninterruptedly every Sunday till the last, when he preached on the "Holy Eucharist," to an immense congregation.

A STRATFORD correspondent, "Classic City," writes us to say that the Rev. Father McGee, for two years curate in that populous and important parish, and recently appointed to a pastorate of his own, leaves Stratford with the good wishes of the entire Catholic congregation of that place.

IT MAY be interesting to many of our readers to know that Rev. Father Coffey's work on "Catholic Canada," now approaching completion, will contain chapters on the Brownite anti-Catholic movement, on the struggle for Catholic schools, and on Orangism in Canada.

We are pleased to notice that our distinguished townsman, W. R. Meredith, Q. C. M. P., heads the list of the successful candidates for the position of Benchers of the Law Society of Ontario. This fact speaks volumes for Mr. Meredith's professional standing and popularity among his brethren of the long robe.

The following are the correct figures showing the strength of the three parties in the British House of Commons at the close of the last general election:

	Irish Nat.	Lib.	Con.
England	1	233	224
Ireland	25	15	15
Scotland	64	8	3
Wales	27	3	3
	85	324	265

In reply to our respected correspondent from Port Dalhousie, we beg to state that the following Irish Nationalist M. P.'s are Protestants: Charles Stewart Parnell, Cork City; Jeremiah Jordan, Clare West; John Hooper, Cork South East; Charles K. Tanner, Cork Mid; John Francis Small, Down South; Sir Thomas Edmond, Dublin South; Henry Campbell, Fernmanagh South; Jasper Douglas Pyne, Waterford West; Alexander Blaine, Armagh South; Wm. Abraham, Limerick West.

THE Kingston *Freeman* says of Ald. Bermingham of that city, now about to leave for Pittsburg, Pa.: He is a really graceful and vigorous speaker, and invariably secures the attention of his brother Aldermen, who know that his ideas are always of a practical character. The council and the city will suffer a notable loss in his retirement from the role of city fathers. In business and social circles, Ald. Bermingham has ever been a general favourite. Possessed of a more than ordinarily handsome and prepossessing appearance, and with a character as manly and attractive as his exterior person, his success is assured wherever energy, good judgment and probity and the enjoyment of all the qualities which go to make up a thorough gentleman are a passport to prosperity and popularity. He is one of Kingston's sons whose career he can watch with pride and confidence.

We look upon Ald. Bermingham's departure in the light of a grave loss to the whole Catholic body of Ontario, which has but few representative men of his sterling character.

It is pleasing to note that, amid the opposition offered Mr. Gladstone from so many quarters, "the British Home Rule Association, of which Earl Ashburnham is President, is receiving numerous adhesions constantly, and has become a powerful element in popular politics. The Association is preparing to make a vigorous campaign throughout the country to advocate Gladstone's Bill. Lord Ashburnham is a Liberal-Conservative and is a member of the most exclusive of aristocratic clubs, where he has been boycotted since he adopted the advocacy of Home Rule for Ireland.

THE Toronto *Globe* of Saturday, under the heading of "A good time in Toronto," published a narrative of very questionable and objectionable conduct on the part of a young man named Black. Our contemporary thus concludes its narrative: "A *Globe* reporter learned from other sources that about six months ago Mr. Black had become converted, and since that time has been engaged as an earnest worker in connection with the Y. M. C. A. and Knox Church, and is looked upon by his friends as a sincere and consistent Christian." We are glad to hear of Mr. Black's "consistent" Christianity, but we think the *Globe* had done better by leaving the Black story alone, and that Mr. Black had better not boast too loudly of his "conversion." He was sadly in need of a change.

IN THE San Antonio, Texas, *Daily Express* report of the St. Patrick's Day celebration in that city, we are pleased to read that the orator of the day was an old London boy, Mr. H. P. Drought. The *Express* says of his speech: "The address of Mr. H. P. Drought, who was introduced in appropriate terms by the president, Mr. T. F. Brady, was a very eloquent one, replete with glowing tributes to the beautiful but oppressed Island, 'every foot of whose soil is hallowed by the blood of martyrs to the cause of her freedom.' In it he depicted the sufferings of her people and the cruel wrongs heaped upon them by British tyranny, and spoke of the genius of her sons and the beauty and virtue of her daughters." It is indeed gratifying to us to receive such an assurance that London abroad is doing honor to London at home.

LORD WOLSELEY is reported to have said in a speech in London on Friday evening that the British Empire had been built and preserved through the valour and endurance of its soldiers and sailors, directed by able statesmen. Hitherto it had been their lot to defend their country against foreign foes, but now they were called upon by the people of England to do duty in tramping under foot enemies more serious, because they were enemies within the civil boundaries. He called upon the English nation to say "Stand still" to any one, whoever he might be, who should dare to try to break or dismember the Empire, thereby ruthlessly destroying it. Lord Wolseley's speech was received with deafening cheers. Military men are not, as a rule, judicious speakers. Silence with them is in fact golden. Lord Wolseley has not of late been a success as a soldier; he must egregiously fail if he attempt statesmanship.

St. Patrick's Literary Society.

The annual meeting of the St. Patrick's Literary Society took place in their hall on Thursday evening, April 1st. The meeting was kept in till a very late hour, as there was a good deal of business to be transacted. At the close of the meeting the election of officers for the ensuing year took place, when the following gentlemen were elected:—President, James Sarsfield; Vice President, William Duff Secretary, Wm. J. Long; Recording Secretary, John Sarsfield; Corresponding Secretary, Jas. A. Stuey; Treasurer, Wm. Jewell; Marshall, Taos. Deane; Librarian, John Ryan, sr.; Managing Committee—John McKinnon, John O'Donnell, Thos. J. Meagher, John Shields, P. Dolan, A. Cassidy, Jas. Whelan. During the evening many new members were proposed, and a good deal of important business was brought up, which had to be deferred till next meeting.—*Pembroke Observer*, April 9.

Oshawa Separate School.

Mr. J. F. White, Inspector for Separate Schools for the Province of Ontario, paid his annual visit to the Separate School of Oshawa last Thursday afternoon and Friday. We are pleased to learn that after a very searching examination, just before leaving, it was his pleasure to place on record on the visitors' book the following very flattering report—"I am happy to be able to say that on my visit to this Separate School, Oshawa, I find the accommodation and equipment all that can be desired. The order and tone of the school are in all respects quite satisfactory. This school ranks high among the schools of the Province, and its prospects are very bright." J. F. White, Oshawa, April 2nd. This report speaks for itself, and it must be a great source of pleasure to the good sisters who have worked so hard to see their efforts crowned with success, and it ought to be a matter of pride and pleasure to the citizens of Oshawa to know that the Separate as well as the Public Schools of this town are in so flourishing a condition.—*Oshawa Pindicator*.