

British people, showing as they do the generosity characteristic of the Irish heart. They say:

"We gratefully acknowledge the loyalty and fidelity with which you have kept your promises to the Irish people under difficulties insurmountable to any but the highest order of statesmanship. We earnestly hope that God, who has bestowed upon you such wonderful mental and physical powers, will prolong your life and enable you to complete the great work of ending internecine strife, bringing peace and strength to the Empire, and peace and prosperity to Ireland."

It is suggestive too that the first name signed to this document is that of Dr. Thomas Addis Emmet, the grandson of one who was himself one of the exiles from Ireland, and the grand-nephew of one who suffered on the scaffold for love of Ireland, one whose last words still send a thrill of patriotism through the veins of Irishmen the world over, when they are called to mind.

A COWARDLY CONTROVERSIALIST.

"A noble aim. Faithfully kept is as a noble deed."

Permit us to say, Rev. Mr. Wallace, that you have not kept your aim. The prefix "Rev." gives one the impression that you belong to that class of men to whom truth and charity should be dearer than life; but after reading the article in *Knox College Monthly* on the "Papacy or Anti-Christ," we are inclined to imagine that "Rev." stands for redoubtable, for surely such an effusion may well make a man redoubtable to all who have Christian courtesy and charity.

Mr. Wallace is a type of that class of men who do their thinking by proxy. Bereft of originality, they evolve nothing from out their own consciousness. Preconceived opinions close the intellect to the glorious sunshine of truth, and the intolerant spirit of bigotry makes them look with baleful eye upon all who differ from them in religious belief.

It is repugnant, Mr. Wallace, to strike a cause a traitor blow. It is no mark of scholarship to impose on the credulity and ignorance of your readers, by the use of garbled quotations; and it is no compliment to your manhood to foment a spirit of aggressive hatred towards others. You do not say this, but you mean it. You commence your article with the gratuitous assertion that the priests of the early Church had forgotten the spirit of Christ, and then you parade the controversial curiosities that amused a bye-gone generation, and you conclude in the most approved style, The Church of Rome is all I say it to be.

We commend to your attention the words of St. Paul, "Wherefore putting away lying, speak ye the truth every man with his neighbor."

Mr. Wallace refers to Pope Joan, a mythical personage. No reputable minister would dare to allude to this, so utterly discredited is it by historians. He gives a "tariff of sins" by which many iniquities were sanctioned at Rome: thus, for a man that killed father or mother, wife or sister, 10s. 6d.; for a priest that kept a concubine, 10s. 6d.; to eat flesh in time prohibited £1 4s. 6d.—because this latter infringed a rule of the Church, though not the law of God! Is this an instance to what excessive degree prejudice will blind a man?

We admit that we did not think that Canada had a minister pledged presumably to teach others and to give good example, who would pen such mendacious and malicious statements. We challenge him to produce his authority for "the tariff of sins." He cannot do it. He knows that he utters a sentiment as false as he himself is to the cause for which he was commissioned. It has been proved false, and no man with any regard for social amenities, with any respect for truth, gives it credence.

For an honorable opponent we have every consideration, but for a cowardly controversialist, who resorts to every trick of sophistry and falsehood, we have unmitigated contempt. When the Knights of the Middle Ages met one who had through ignoble conduct shown himself unworthy, they touched him not with their swords for fear the contact should sully them, but they scourged him from their presence with their dog-whips.

When next you write, Mr. Wallace, bear in mind that you are commanded not to bear false witness against your neighbor, and that your reputation will not be enhanced by the repetition of vile and oft-refuted calumnies. This is advice kindly meant. Protestants are not as gullible as formerly, and ministers may not transgress the bounds of propriety without incurring justly merited contempt.

We confess that, thinking the article to be written in a calm and unprejudiced vein, we intended reviewing it, but we turn from the task with loathing and disgust. It is a veritable cesspool of misrepresentation and falsehood.

What can sensible people think of a man who says that constitutional liberty and Catholic liberty cannot agree, and, moreover, declares that such is the opinion of the leading spirits of Rome! When he affirms that the Catholic Church, by commanding her priests to live unmarried, enjoins a course that almost necessarily leads her priests into sin, "especially when connected with the confessional, with its infamous and soul-polluting questions to young and confiding females," he grossly insults thousands of women who live chastely and men who aim but to help their fellows and to serve God. When he asserts that God has ordered that Christian ministers should be married he betrays a woful ignorance of Scripture.

The end, Mr. Wallace, justifies the means, in your case. Nothing is too unclean for your touch. The religion of others demands a fair and dispassionate investigation, but you vomit forth upon it all the low insinuations and base charges and accusations that a depraved mind can conceive. And yet we pity you from our heart. A misguided zeal has made you heedless of the mandates of gentlemanly behavior, not to speak of Christianity. We may be permitted to remind you that a minister may not slander and calumniate more than any other man; and in conclusion we feel inclined to tell you that a Catholic catechism will furnish you with a knowledge of Catholic doctrine. Now keep cool, Mr. Wallace: wipe the froth of bigotry off your lips and look up a vocabulary of kind and decent language.

After reading your remarks on the Confessional, it is refreshing to turn to the pages of Leibnitz, as good a Protestant as yourself, and perhaps as intelligent:—

"I look upon a pious, earnest and discreet confessor as a great instrument in the hands of God for the salvation of souls: for his counsels serve to direct our affections, to enlighten us as to our faults, to help us to avoid occasions of sin, to dissipate doubts, to raise the downcast spirit—in fact, to remove or mitigate all diseases of the soul; and if we can hardly find anything on earth more excellent than a faithful friend, what happiness to find one who shall be bound by the invisible religion of a Divine sacrament to preserve the faith and to succor souls."

Voltaire says that it (the Confessional) is a divine institution, which has had its origin only in the infinite mercy of its Author, and that the enemies of the Roman Church who have opposed so beneficial an institution have taken from man the greatest restraint that can be put on crime.

Lord Fitzwilliam says that it is impossible to establish virtue, justice and morality on a solid basis without the tribunal of penance.

We could enumerate many other Protestants who wrote in similar language, but we feel they would be wasted on Mr. Wallace.

HOME RULE.

As every one expected, the Home Rule Bill was thrown out by the House of Lords almost without debate. A special effort was made to secure a huge majority against the Bill, and Tory Lords who never put in an appearance to legislate on other matters were called in by the whips of their party to assert their opposition to the will of the people, with the result that a House wherein seldom the number of votes recorded exceeds 75 defeated Irish Home Rule by 419 to 41. The Lords, of course, represent the great property owners and no one else, and it is very doubtful whether the policy of showing how wide a gulf there is between the wishes of this class and those of the people is a wise one. The Home Rule Bill has been delayed, indeed, by this action, but no one supposes that it has been killed. A reform in the House of Lords will now be demanded by the nation so loudly that it cannot be resisted. The hope of the Tories is that Mr. Gladstone may die, or at least may soon become incapacitated by age so as to be unable to push the measure to success, but there can be little doubt that ultimately the Lords will be forced to yield, and the greater show of opposition they make now the greater will be their humiliation when they are forced to eat their leek.

Learn from your earliest days to inure your principles against the perils of ridicule. You can no more exercise your reason if you live in constant dread of laughter than you can enjoy your life if you are in constant dread of death.

THE FRENCH ELECTIONS.

The French elections, which were begun on Sunday, 20th August, were terminated on the 3rd September. French statesmen seem to have selected Sunday as the regular day for holding elections, for the purpose of showing the world how completely the French Government has set aside the influence of religion; yet we venture to say that the influences of religion proved themselves by the results to be much stronger than they have hitherto been supposed to be, and that they will modify future legislation to a larger extent than heretofore since the Republic was established.

Considering that for the 581 seats in the Chamber there were considerably over 2,000 candidates, or nearly four candidates for each seat, it was not to be expected that the contest would be entirely decided on the first day of polling, as the French law requires that no one shall be held as elected on the first day who shall not have received an actual majority of the votes cast. The second election, however, is decisive.

The final result is that the monarchists have been almost swept out of existence as a party. France has shown that she is determined to uphold the Republic, and a majority approaching to unanimity in its decisiveness has been elected belonging to the "Moderate Republican Party." This party will outnumber largely all others together, including the Radicals and Socialists, who do not differ materially from each other. The last named two parties have also made gains, but such gains will be more than counterbalanced by the great strength of the Moderates, who need not now coquette with the Socialists at all, as they have hitherto been obliged to do, in order to retain a working majority in the Chamber.

It is easily seen that this result has been arrived at owing to a great measure to the advice given by Pope Leo XIII. to French Catholics to sustain the Constitution and support the Republic. The Pope recently writing to the Archbishop of Bordeaux explained lucidly the position he had taken. He desires that "religion in its august majesty should not be mixed in the struggles of human passions, or the deceptive complications of politics, but rather that it should guard its place above all human incidents." For this reason he declares, "we appealed to all French citizens, men of heart and equity, to persuade them to recognize and loyally preserve the Constitution of the country as it is established, and, forgetful of old quarrels, to make strenuous efforts to have justice and equity preside over the laws so that respect and a state of true liberty may be insured to the Church, and that thus in common fraternal effort they might provide for the prosperity of the common fatherland."

In his previous letter, addressed to all the Bishops, the Holy Father had said: "Every form of Government is good, if it only knows how to lead directly to the end for which all social authority is instituted, which is the common good."

The legislation of France has been irreligious, and the Holy Father, therefore, while exhorting all Catholics to support the Republic, urges them also to sink their differences of opinion in regard to the form of Government and to correct the evil of irreligious legislation by recording their votes for good Christians and Catholics.

The recent elections show that the Catholics have acted upon this advice. They have ceased their hitherto determined opposition to the Republic, and the result is a triumph for the Republicans, indeed, but a triumph for moderation also. The Catholics have, we have no doubt, gained largely by the elections. They have met with some losses, it is true, and amongst them is the loss of the Count de Mun, their leader. It would appear that his extreme adhesion to royalty has been the cause of his defeat; but the Catholic gains will perhaps more than counterbalance this reverse.

It is to be remarked that among those elected there are about twenty who are named as belonging to a new party, "the Rallies." These are men who had formerly been Monarchists, but who have conformed to the wish of the Pope to support the Republic. These will be found in the ranks of the Moderate Republicans, and will contribute towards bringing about a change for the better in the Government policy.

Among those defeated are the Radical leaders, Messrs. Clemenceau and Floquet, with large majorities against them. Cluseret, who was identified with the Commune at its worst, has been

elected for his department, so also has Wilson, who was driven out from the Chamber for procuring from his father-in-law, President Grevy, decorations of the Legion of Honor for a monetary payment. Many of those who were intimately associated with the Panama scandal will also sit in the Chamber which makes laws for France.

Surely the curiosities of a French election are many, and it is difficult to penetrate the mystery of the causes which operate in producing them.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

POPE LEO XIII., ever eager to promote the interests of the working classes, has written a letter to M. de Curtius, chief of the Swiss Catholics, and organizer of the International Catholic Workingmen's Congress, saying that His Holiness approves of international legislation to protect workingmen and children. They indeed, with the iron yoke of the capitalist upon their necks, need protection.

The practical morality of the confessional has been again illustrated by the restitution of forty thousand francs to the French Treasury through the Abbe de Mauberge, a chaplain of Notre Dame des Victoires in Paris. The money had been stolen from the Government by one of its employees, but the culprit on going to confession was obliged to restore his ill-gotten treasure.

It is stated on the best authority that the Holy Father is preparing an encyclical on the evils of civil marriage. This document, it is said, will be soon issued. In the meantime Father Brandi, the eminent Jesuit writer, is preparing, by direction of the Pope, an article which will appear in the *Civiltà Cattolica* of Rome setting forth all the reasons already given by the Italian Bishops against giving civil marriage precedence over the religious ceremony. The laws allowing divorce will also be treated of, and full statistics will be given of the prevalence of divorce in those countries where it is permitted by law.

JUDGE DIXON has decided that a common law marriage is valid in New Jersey, and has thus defined a marriage of this kind:

"If a man and a woman, capable of contracting marriage, mutually agree to become at once husband and wife, especially if they thereupon assume the rights and duties of the married state, they thenceforward are married to each other."

Needless to wonder that so many homes are desolate when such vague notions of the married state prevail in the minds of legislators. Thinking men are alarmed at the increasing growth of indifference toward that which gives strength to civil society and sanctifies the family, and demand the help of the Church that is endeavoring to stem the current that is bearing society back to pagan degradation.

The Oxford University magnates are considerably nettled by some remarks of Professor Blackie of Edinburgh anent the study of Greek. "I have the greatest contempt," he says, "for the young prigs from Oxford who think because they scan a few lines of an old tragedian that they are sent from heaven as oracles of all wisdom. A modern Greek cannot understand a single word of Oxford Greek. Oxford in this view is a school of conceit, for scholarship is a miserable thing. You can't really teach a language by mere grammar anymore than you can teach dancing or chess by book."

The knowledge of a language depends, then, upon leisure and a considerable expenditure of money—luxuries enjoyed by few students! Why not erase Greek from a college curriculum if it cannot be mastered save by living in them and speaking in them.

WHILE the Catholic exhibit at the World's Fair has excited universal astonishment owing to the evidences it affords of progress in every department, and especially that of education, the Methodists are complaining of the failure of their exhibit, and through shame many are urging that it be closed. A correspondent of *Zion's Herald*, a Methodist organ, speaks as follows in a recent issue of that journal:

"Speaking of our exhibit, one does not hear the most complimentary things concerning it. In comparison with that of the Roman Catholic Church we are told that ours is a meagre affair and consists mainly of relics and mementoes of departed worthies. Surely we haven't gone into the relic business! Who cares about John Wesley's teapot, or Bishop Ashbury's shoe-horn? It is commonly reported that while the exhibit of the Roman

Catholic Church covers a space of over twenty thousand feet ours could be set up on a few good sized tables. Perhaps one of the reasons why we are so anxious to have it removed is because we are ashamed of it."

NOTWITHSTANDING the fact that New Mexico has a thriving population considerably larger than that of some of the recently erected States, every effort to extend the privilege of statehood to that territory has hitherto been unsuccessful. It is generally attributed to anti-Catholic prejudice that there has been so much opposition to the admission of that Catholic territory to the rights of statehood, though it possesses all the conditions which are requisite for admission, but it is certain that political considerations have had much weight in causing the delay. It is taken for granted that as a State, the vote of New Mexico will be Democratic, and the Republicans, who have so long controlled Congress, were in no hurry to add to the Democratic strength in Presidential and Congressional elections. For the first time since the civil war the Democrats have now real control of both Congress and the Administration; and an effort is again being made to establish the territory in its rights. This effort will probably be successful, as it will be only an act of justice to recognize the progress of New Mexico during recent years.

THE Apostles of the United States are expressing great indignation against President Cleveland on account of his recent respectful letter written to the Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII. They fear that it is an indication that Mgr. Satoli will be officially recognized by the United States Government as Pontifical Envoy. There appears to be no foundation for this expectation, as the Pontifical Alegate was not sent for any civil function, except inasmuch as he represented the Holy Father as custodian of the Columbian relics sent to the World's Fair. Under this aspect his connection with the civil authorities will cease as soon as the relics will be given back to his custody. But his office as representative of the Pope in America is purely an ecclesiastical one, for which no civil recognition is needed. There is no doubt, however, that he will always be treated with respect by those in authority, to whatever political party they may belong. The Republican President, Harrison, honored Mgr. Satoli just as President Cleveland has done; and this is undoubtedly due to the importance of the Catholic Church in America, and the social influence of the Catholic Hierarchy. All the froth and foam which may be expended by the A. P. A. will not change this, and the members of that organization would show more wisdom if they accepted the inevitable instead of exhibiting their impotence as they are now doing.

HOME RULE REJECTED BY THE HOUSE OF LORDS.

London, Sept. 8.—The House of Lords rejected the Home Rule Bill by a vote of 419 to 41.

Although it was generally understood that the House of Lords would reject the Home Rule Bill to-night the House did not till up to the last hour, popular interest centering in the speech of the Marquis of Salisbury, who was not expected to rise until towards midnight. In the meantime Lord Salisbury, Baron Herschell, Baron Monkswell and the Bishop of Ripon had spoken to half empty benches. After 9 o'clock the scene outside and inside the House lived up as members and visitors began streaming in. The peeresses, strangers and diplomatic galleries showed a few vacant seats. Conspicuously occupying a portion of the area of the House were twenty-two Bishops attired in their capacious robes with lawn sleeves. The Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishop of London, the Bishop of Oxford and every notable church dignitary were present. Members of the House of Commons crowded the access and standing room around the throne.

The debate in the House reached the acme of dullness in the Earl of Morley's mauling against the bill. A number of other peers were on the roll to speak, but a scene of weariness affected them as well as the House generally. So Lord Salisbury seized a chance during a momentary pause rose at 10:20 o'clock and amid rapturous cheers and began his rather lengthy speech. The Earl of Kimberley, Lord President of the Council and Secretary of State for India, replied briefly to Lord Salisbury. The Lord Chancellor then put the motion for the second reading of the bill. He cannot some merriment by crying, "I think the 'contents' have it." Very loud and determined was the rival cry, "The contents have it." The House divided at midnight, and the result was the rejection of the motion by a vote of 419 to 41.

The Marquis of Waterford voted sitting and the Earl of Galloway voted while lying at full length on a bench. Lord Headley returned from a hunting expedition on the Zambesi River in order to be able to vote. All the Bishops went with the majority. The announcement of the result was received with laughter and cheering. The House then cleared of spectators and adjourned immediately.

PRESS COMMENTS ON THE LORDS' ACTION.

London Sept. 9.—The *Daily News*, commenting on the fate of the Home Rule Bill in the House of Lords, says: "Nothing is more favorable to the success of a political or social reform than a large hostile majority in the House of Lords. If the Tories had had more sense they would have made the majority smaller and we would have fared worse."

The *Daily Chronicle* says: "Our reply is simple. The addition of the House of Lords now becomes a plank of the Radical platform, and the clauses of the Home Rule Bill providing for a second chamber in Ireland must be modified. Down with the House of Lords. It is useless mincing words."

THE DEMOCRACY SCORNED.

The New York *World's* special cable despatch says of the Home Rule debate and vote in the Lords: "The debate was conducted by picked men of the Peers. The speeches therefore for the most part were of a high class, but almost all were spoiled by indistinct, often mumbled delivery. To this, however, the listener to English-speaking must get accustomed. Lord Roseberry won the highest honors, speaking for the bill with a contentment for his noble hearers so thickly veiled that it must have been irritating to the extreme. Most of the speeches were against the bill, and Peers seemed to strive with one another in saying scornful things of democracy. Even Lord Salisbury, usually cautious and discreet, gave way to his feelings and snarled at that democracy which threatens to sweep him and his order out of existence. The scene at the division was memorable. When the call came the whole House arose and, as it seemed, streamed towards the Opposition lobby. Forty-one Government Peers kept their seats until the tidal wave had disappeared. Then, forlornly, slowly, they passed to the Ministerial lobby and Peers pressed scornful laughter of high born women in the galleries. Lord Salisbury had thought to muster 300. When it was announced 419 had voted against further consideration of the Home Rule Bill he applauded with the rest. A fact worth recording in connection with the division is that of the 100 Peers of Mr. Gladstone's creation from the Liberal ranks only ten voted for the Bill."

JOYFUL HOME RULERS.

CONGRATULATIONS TO GLADSTONE FROM IRISHMEN IN AMERICA.

When the joyful news of the passage of the Home Rule Bill reached Boston, the I. N. F. of Massachusetts sent the following cable-gram and letter. The cable-gram reads:

Boston, Sept. 2.

To Right Hon. William E. Gladstone:

The State Committee of the Irish National Federation of Massachusetts congratulate you on the passage of the Home Rule Bill by the House of Commons—the wisest and best measure enacted for England and Ireland in the nineteenth century.

(Signed) THOMAS J. GARGAN, Chairman. DANIEL P. SULLIVAN, Sec.

The letter was: Boston, Sept. 2, 1893. Justin McCarthy, M. P., Chairman of the Irish Parliamentary Party:

DEAR SIR—In the name of the Irish National Federation of Massachusetts, we desire to congratulate you and your patriotic colleagues on the successful passage of the Home Rule Bill by the House of Commons.

We have watched with anxious hope its successive stages through the House, and have admired the courage and devotion of its advocates in their unflinching zeal to carry it through successfully.

Especially have we prayed for the preservation of the great Liberal statesman, William E. Gladstone, to whose able leadership this happy result is so largely due.

We recognize in the peace and contentment it must bring to the Irish people a substantial benefit to the English nation by fostering the bonds of universal harmony and establishing that mutual confidence and respect which is the basis of all good government.

Trusting that its final triumph will be but a question of a short duration, we remain,

Very respectfully yours,

THOMAS J. GARGAN, Chairman. DANIEL P. SULLIVAN, Secretary.

The following cable message was sent to Mr. Gladstone by the officers of The I. N. F. of America:

The Irish National Federation of America, on behalf of the millions of our race on this continent, congratulate you and the Liberal party, whose honored leader you are, on the constitutional victory achieved in the passage of the Home Rule Bill.

We gratefully acknowledge the loyalty and fidelity with which you have kept your promise to the Irish people under difficulties insurmountable to any but the highest order of statesmanship. We earnestly hope that God, who has bestowed upon you such mental and physical powers, will prolong your life and enable you to complete the great work of ending internecine strife, bringing peace and strength to the empire and peace and prosperity to Ireland.

DR. THOMAS ADDIS EMMET, President.

EUGENE KELLY, Treasurer.

JOHN BYRNE, Chairman Ex. Com.

JOSEPH P. RYAN, Secretary.

"She Looketh Well"

to the ways of her household." Yes, Solomon is right; that's what the good housekeeper everywhere does, but particularly in Canada.

But her ways are not always old ways. In fact she has discarded many unsatisfactory old ways. For instance, to-day she is using



the New Shortening, instead of lard. And this is in itself a reason why "she looketh well" in another sense, for she eats no lard to cause poor digestion and a worse complexion.

COTTOLENE is much better than lard for all cooking purposes, as every one who has tried it declares. Have you tried it?

For sale everywhere.

Made only by N. K. FAIRBANK & CO., Wellington and Ann Sts., MONTREAL.

Margaret L. Shepherd

A COMPLETE ACCOUNT OF HER LIFE. A single copy, 25c; 50c for 2 copies. Address: T. J. COFFEY, Catholic Record Office, Toronto, Ont.

LOVE & DIGNAN, BARRISTERS, ETC., 418 Talbot street, London. Private fondness to loan.