

The True Witness

AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY
BY THE PROPRIETOR,
JOHN GILLIES,
AT NO. 195 FORTIFICATION LANE.

Editor—Rev. Dr. O'REILLY, Miss. Ap.

TERMS YEARLY IN ADVANCE:

To all country Subscribers, Two Dollars.
To all City Subscribers whose papers are delivered
by carriers, Two Dollars and a half.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, April 7, 1876.

ECCLIASTICAL CALENDAR.

APRIL, 1876.

Friday, 7—Seven Dolours of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

Saturday, 8—Of the Feria.

Sunday, 9—PALM SUNDAY.

Monday, 10—Of the Feria.

Tuesday, 11—Of the Feria.

Wednesday, 12—Of the Feria.

Thursday, 13—MACRDAY THURSDAY

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

Five hundred men are constantly employed in restoring the Hotel de Ville at Paris. The new building will cost one million of francs.

The O'Connell League in Italy held a conference in Bologna in the interest of Catholic education. On separating they were hooted and stoned by a mob of roughs. The police feebly interfered to protect order.

The Direct Cable is again broken; the break is between Rye and Torbay. Electricians' tests have located the break in the Direct Cable just inside twenty miles of Rye Beach, N. H.—The suddenness of the break seems to indicate a complete fracture.

The Italian deficit this year is only \$8,000,000! They have taken that much from the religious and educational establishments, but robbers never get rich.

It is stated that the Congregation of Rites have reported against the canonization of Joan of Arc.

Among the various heretical sects which have sprung up in Rome since the breach of Porta Pia and which have been originated and maintained by English and American contributors, there is an association termed itself the "American, Episcopal, Methodist, Military, and Evangelical Church in Rome—*Chiesa evangelica, militare, metodista, episcopale, Americana in Roma.*" This new church, with so many titles, was founded some years ago by one Luigi Capellini. This Capellini, by some process best known to himself became an Evangelical minister, and in that capacity celebrated the most solemn religious functions. Afterwards, however, he received another ordination. He was ordained Deacon, by an American Methodist Bishop, in the morning of a certain day, and in the evening of the same day he was made a full minister. Capellini is now the head of the Evangelical Military Church in Rome, which is maintained at the cost of the Committee of the American Methodist Church, the paymaster being a Mr. Vernon. While these sectarians abuse the liberty extended to them by a revolutionary Government, they are opposed to the concession to others of similar liberty. One of their newspapers, the *Corriere Evangelico*, combats vigorously the efforts made by Catholics to obtain freedom of Education. These "apes of France," it says, "want liberty in teaching, and by this what do they mean? They wish to prepare another generation more corrupt and depraved than the present, which they are educating by violence, agitation, and bribery." This journal is filled with vile abuse of Catholics, and with persistent misrepresentation of Catholic doctrines.

There are at present in Rome two Bishops whose names are mentioned with reverence all over the Catholic World. They have had an extraordinary similarity of career, both have been raised to the Episcopal dignity at the special request of Emperors, and both have just issued from prisons into which they were cast by their patrons. Those prelates are the celebrated Ledochowski of Posen, and Mgr. Vital of Olinda, in Brazil.

The Spanish Government is treating the Carlists who submit with a wise leniency. All who come in before the 15th of March are to receive a complete amnesty, except that deserters from the army will have to complete their term of service, those who deserted before the proclamation of the 15th of July, in Africa, and those who have deserted since in other Spanish possessions. Those who deserted before the 15th of July and have been made prisoners, will be sent to serve in Cuba with a prolongation of term. And the Carlists who do not accept the amnesty by the 15th of March, and are captured subsequently to that date, will be sent to serve in the army beyond the seas or transported as the Government may determine. Of these there are not likely to be many, for the Carlists are accepting the amnesty in masses and fraternising with the Royal troops, and those who had crossed the frontier are being sent back in batches of two or three hundred. By a decree of the 8th of March (Wednesday) the Carlists who have taken refuge in France since the 1st of February have forty days from the date of the decree given them to come in; their leaders will have to take the oath of allegiance before a Spanish Consul, and those who have occupied certain positions—such as Ministers war delegates, judges, notaries, or civil servants are excepted from the benefits of this decree. The provinces of Biscay and Navarre are to be occupied by a force of 80,000 men under General Martinez Campos, and the reduction of the army has already begun. The soldiers of the class of 1870 have been sent to their homes, and only about 200,000 men are to be kept under arms, 30,000 of them being sent as a reinforcement to Cuba, where the insurgents have just suffered a defeat. King Alfonso has been warmly received at Vittoria. After he has visited Santander and Burgos, he is to make his public entry into Madrid on the 15th, with the 112 pieces of cannon taken from the Carlists.

Berlin assumes more and more the aspect of a

heathenish city which Protestant missionaries are trying to Christianize. The report just published by the "Town Mission of Berlin on its works during the past year, unfolds a frightful picture of the religious unbelief and moral degeneracy of the inhabitants. For the instruction of our readers we select a few specimens of the spirit that prevails among the population of "New Athens." To their exhortation the missionaries received answers like these:—"There is no God, else we should not witness so many acts of injustice in the world."—"Children must be taught religion, but we, grown-up people, know it is all nonsense. Man is like any other animal, only he has more reason."—"Another wise Berliner said to a missionary: 'Are you still so stupid as to believe you have a soul?'—Of Christ a shopkeeper said: 'He was a good man, but he loved far too much: everybody ought to think of himself first.' Let not our readers think that these were isolated remarks, or that they proceeded only from the lower classes. The report distinctly states that high and low are uniformly imbued with such Pagan views. 'In thirty years,' said a highly educated gentleman, 'there will be no more clergymen, because people cease to study theology. Then we shall make your churches places of amusement.'—A middle aged 'lady' declared: 'I never went to church since I was thirteen, the bible is untrue, and we know nothing about a life after death.'—Of course hundreds of thousands in Berlin never utter a word of prayer. One of the missionaries when inviting 'good people to come to church, frequently received replies such as these: 'Nonsense, it is all over with the church, reason is supreme now, not faith—the God, as you call him, will soon be done away with; it is all a lie and a swindle.' On baptism and marriage the enlightened Berliners entertain curious ideas. A workman having been asked to send his child to church to be christened replied: 'O, I had my child baptised yesterday at the register office.' Another man was surprised to hear that baptism and marriage were still 'going on,' and a third said, the Church had no right whatever to ask people to be married in church—we abstain from all comment, for these things speak for themselves.

THE PROTESTANT ALLIANCE BACKING DOWN.

A letter which appeared in the *Montreal Gazette* of the 21st of March, over the signature of W. B. G., has suggested to us the above heading. The writer complains of some comments made by the Editor of the *Gazette* on some words of a Scotch Correspondent of the *Witness*. The article alluded to is headed "Honest at last." It appeared in the *Gazette* of the 16th of March. The Extract, although lengthy, will repay perusal. Our readers will be better enabled to form an opinion of the justness of the views and comments of the Editor of the *Gazette*:

HONEST AT LAST.—There is no longer any difficulty in rightly interpreting the real motive of those who have recently, with Sir Alexander Galt as their interpreter, inaugurated a new departure in the politics of this country. The organ of the movement, our evening contemporary the *Witness*, has let the cat out of the bag. It prints, in a recent number, a letter from Scotland on the Oka troubles, which has the peculiar merit of being outspoken and honest. This correspondent thus states his views:—"All success to this new movement in the States. Let the people of America be assured, whether they be dwellers in the Dominion or yield allegiance to Washington, that there are no enemies so obnoxious as constitutional liberty as priests. The very day the Pope was born all good lexicographers began to spell despot with a p. Let the 'Spelling Bee' be aware of that, you may of your liberality and stupidity give the franchise to lay papists, but you have not enfranchised a man of them. All you have effected is to hand over a certain number of suffrages to the leading priest, who transubstantiates them in to peps and ballot urns into holes. 'Catholic Emancipation' was all a delusion."

Now that has the merit of being a straightforward, honest expression of opinion. We have heard it from others, but not with the same boldness. It has the further merit of being a consistent and logical conclusion of the present agitation. The Scotch correspondent of our contemporary is not the only one who thus exposes the real object of this new departure. A comic paper in Toronto has equally hit the nail on the head in describing Sir Alexander Galt's letter as an incident of a "no popery" agitation. If the gentlemen who have inaugurated this movement would be all as honest in their admission of its real object, there would at least be a fair issue presented. It would perhaps be rather difficult to reconcile it with the principles of "civil and religious liberty" of which we now hear so much in such strange and remarkable connection. The lesson which they now repeat so flippantly, that Catholic emancipation is only tolerable on condition of Catholics voting as they are dictated to by the most extreme of the political Protestant party. We thank our contemporary for having thus, through its correspondent, whose letter is introduced approvingly, informed us frankly of the real object of the new departure.

How many of the Protestants of this Dominion are prepared to act out the principles that are now pressed upon them, as interpreted logically and clearly by this Scotch correspondent and by *Grip*? There is no escaping the issue which is thus presented, and which is the only logical one possible. Are we prepared in Canada for a "no Popery" crusade? Are we prepared to say that one-third of the people of this Dominion, simply because they are "Lay Papists," are to be deprived of the franchise? But are we, Protestants, boasting by virtue of our Protestantism that we believe in the principles of civil and religious liberty, prepared to make the religious opinions of our neighbours a ground for denying them the civil rights we claim for ourselves? That is the issue now presented, and thus fairly and frankly stated, not by us, but through the unchallenged medium of the correspondence in the *Witness*, it is our duty to act upon it. We have no fear that in this free land views such as those urged upon us, will be accepted by any considerable number of the people. But the fact that they are presented should serve as a warning to us of the danger which surrounds the agitation which is attempted to be forced upon us.

In addition to the foregoing words of the *Gazette* we may say that the violent speeches of the members of the Alliance, their conduct adopted in dealing with matters beyond the express object of the association, and the fact of the Scotch correspondence being admitted into the columns of the *Witness* without a mark of disapprobation, justify the conclusions mentioned in the above article.

Now that the logical conclusion of the agitation inaugurated by the Alliance is so clearly pointed out, and that an avowal or adoption of these con-

clusions would shock the public sentiment, the Apologist of the Alliance deems it necessary to inform the public that the members of the Alliance never did entertain the idea of denying to Catholics the civil rights which they as Protestants claim for themselves, they find it necessary to recede of back down from their position in the meddling with matters foreign to the Alliance. They through their Apologist studiously point out the object of the Alliance, which is expressed in the following words:—

OBJECTS.—The constitutional resistance of all efforts on the part of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy to violate the principles of civil and religious rights and liberties, and the guidance and protection of Protestants and others who may be exposed to the persecution of the Romish priesthood for consciences sake.

If they will confine their attention to the objects mentioned it will be "much ado about nothing." There is in fact no cause or necessity whatsoever for the formation and existence of the Alliance, for the Catholic Hierarchy of the Province have never in the past attempted to violate the principles of civil and religious rights and liberties, nor is there any appearance of their doing so in the future.

That the Alliance was not necessary and that it was unequalled for is not a mere assertion of ours. "Mr. Joly," says the *Gazette* of 21st March, "the former leader of the Liberal party (of the Local Legislature) has denounced more vigorously than any other public man this Protestant Defence Alliance as not only useless but mischievous." The *Globe* cannot certainly be accused for its Roman Catholic tendencies—here it is: "That the Protestants of Quebec have anything very specially to complain of we can scarcely bring our minds to believe." Again in an article entitled "The Liberals of Quebec":—

Their (Protestant) list of grievances so far as we have seen it, has very little to do with Protestantism at all, and does not make out a case of hardship which any dispassionate jury in the world would declare to press on them chiefly or at all because they are Protestants.—*Weekly Globe, March 3rd.*

Mr. T. White in his letter to Sir Alexander Galt says:—

The Protestant Minority of the Province of Quebec have had no reason up to this time to doubt the liberality and fairness of the majority in all matters affecting their interests. The guarantees which you secured to them at the time of confederation remain to this day intact. No suggestion has ever been made looking to their abrogation. No request made by Protestants have ever been refused. A mere handful in the legislature, although nearly three times as many as, by the strict division of Roman Catholic and Protestant, they could secure, they had the most absolute and entire control over every interest specially belonging to them, and subject to the action of the legislature. Their position certainly cannot be benefitted by any attempt at political organization based upon religious opinions such as you suggest.

We may be permitted to allude here incidentally to Mr. Huntington's Argentuill Speech, and Sir Alexander Galt's letter, which form a part of the recent no Popery Crusade. The Speech of the former has been condemned in and out of Parliament, and the letter of the latter has been pronounced a failure and a political blunder on his part, and the Defence Alliance, as the above quotations amply testify, has been denounced in terms clear and emphatic.

It is an old saying that out of evil comes good—it is so in the case of the recent agitation, which has afforded an opportunity of publishing to the world, the broad fact which redounds to the honour and credit of the Catholic Majority of Quebec, who have shewn to the Protestant Minority a spirit of the utmost fairness and liberality. The following quotations prove our assertion.

In the matter of Education Mr. White in his letter to Sir Alexander Galt says:—

But what is important for us to know is, that Protestant Education was placed as completely under Protestant Control as was Roman Catholic Education placed under Roman Catholic Control. I think I am right in saying, that every suggestion offered by the Protestant Members of the Council of Public Instruction, was embodied in the Act. THAT IS A FACT TO WHICH I VENTURE TO THINK YOU CANNOT FIND A PARALLEL IN THE EDUCATIONAL LEGISLATION OF ANY OTHER COUNTRY IN THE WORLD.

The same writer in an Editorial of the *Gazette* says:—

We can and do acknowledge that so far as Protestant interests are affected by the legislation of the country, the Religious Majority of the Province have shewn a liberality such as no religious majority in any of the other Provinces of the Dominion have shewn towards the minority differing from them in creed.

Can the same be said of any of the legislatures of the British Empire, or of the United States of America? So far as we know, nothing of the kind can be said. In the Province of Quebec alone, is to be found that true spirit of fair dealing and considerate regard for the rights and interest of their fellow-citizens of other denominations and nationalities.

The legislature and the conduct of the Catholic majority of Quebec towards their Protestant fellow-citizens are models to all legislatures and Protestant majorities of all the English speaking countries. How wide, for instance, is the difference and glaring is the contrast in School matters between the action of the Protestant majority in New Brunswick towards the Catholic minority and the action of the Catholic majority in Quebec towards the Protestant minority. Catholic liberality and considerate regard for the wishes and religious feelings of the Protestant minority, stands in conspicuous contrast against the Protestant illiberality and disregard for the wishes and the religious feelings of the Catholic minority. What is said of New Brunswick may be said, more or less, of other Provinces of the Dominion, and of many legislatures in the United States.

The *Toronto Mail* has well described in a few words the happy relations which existed in this Province between the Catholic and Protestant populations before this "No Popery" agitation began:—

The staunchest Protestants in Quebec, says the *Mail*, are satisfied with the nature of the safeguards they now possess in matters of free religion, untrammelled education, and the utmost civil liberty. They have agreed to differ with the majority on the question of religious belief, and they unite with them cordially in peaceful living, good fellowship and earnest desire to advance the material interest of the country.—*Weekly Mail, March 10th.*

This happy state of affairs the Defence Alliance would 'fain' destroy by their untimely and uncalculated agitation. If it were carried on it would, as the Hon. Mr. Holt well said of Huntington's speech, make a pandemonium of what was heretofore a happy and peaceful country.

It cannot be denied that the action of the Defence Alliance has created some irritation and ill feeling to what extent we are not prepared to say. It is to be hoped that the happy relations heretofore existing have not been impaired to any great extent. At any rate it is our duty as Catholics, notwithstanding the arrogant and intolerant utterances and actions of the Defence Alliance, to do our best endeavours to promote and maintain that harmony and good will and Christian feeling which should exist in every community, and without which no community can exist.

In this editorial we have preferred to give lengthy extracts from the leading organs of public opinion, so that our readers may learn at a glance the views and opinions they entertain of the recently attempted no Popery agitation. We acknowledge with pleasure the honesty and manliness of these leading organs in giving utterance to the liberal sentiments expressed in the foregoing extracts. The powerful influence of the leading organs of the Press will tend to maintain among all classes and creeds of the Dominion that peace and good will so essential to the happiness and prosperity of our Beloved Country.

THE MENTYRE CASE.

Since our last issue we have taken the trouble to look carefully into the pamphlet sent us by the authorities of the Montreal General Hospital, entitled "Documents and Evidence relating to the case of William McEntyre." We are happy to believe that all the papers connected with that sad case are faithfully given. For this the authorities of the Hospital are to be congratulated on their candour at least. The wrong-doing of the Hospital officials towards a dying man, established on evidence not contradicted, and not admitting of contradiction, and for which the Governors could find no reproof nor even preventive for the future, must place these Gentlemen in a position before the public both painful and humiliating. Nor can it raise the reputation of the Hospital in public confidence and esteem, to have it officially made known that in regard to Catholics neither justice nor ordinary protection can be expected from its highest tribunal when the obtaining them requires the sacrifice of religious fanaticism. The small Catholic minority on the Committee, if unable to do more, have at least fully succeeded in demonstrating this; for, on every question and division, we find an intolerant Protestant majority bear down every effort to obtain impartial justice made by the Catholic minority. The proceedings throughout make it evident that religious fanaticism, quite at home in its own stronghold, was determined from the beginning to assert its supremacy, totally regardless of what was due, even for decency sake, to the rights of conscience, and to the charter of the institution as a General Hospital. Proceedings conducted in this spirit, far from being either fair or conciliatory, can be regarded at best but as a grave mockery of justice. No complaint of the St. Patrick's Committee, though proved on oath, was admitted; no suggestion of the Catholic minority was adopted; not a word of regret for the fatal evil done was expressed; not an honest effort recorded to prevent the recurrence of any similar evil in the future. The whole proceedings were fitly wound up with a timid and obscure admission of liberty of conscience in favor of patients; but then the exercise of this religious liberty is so loaded and crippled with conditions; so entirely placed at the mercy of every fanatical house surgeon of the Cameron stamp, as to make the admission of the principle a mere delusion and snare. As a complete bar to the free exercise of liberty of conscience in the General Hospital nothing more effectual could be devised than the By-law recommended by the Governors' Committee. It would be honest to say to the patients at once,—the house surgeon shall be the keeper of your conscience during your stay in the Hospital; but that would be rather odious; so the Governors' Committee, composed of astute men found the means of doing the same thing without incurring the odium. Indeed we are deliberately of opinion that the new By-law, in the mind of the framers, had for object, not the protection of liberty of conscience, but the absolute prevention of any patient, how troubled soever in conscience, and anxious to seek peace in the one-fold before death, over following the example of poor William McEntyre. We would not willingly do the gentlemen of the Committee an injustice, but, knowing the arbitrary and intolerant spirit of exclusive bigotry that rules in the General Hospital, we cannot regret their proceedings in any other sense.

After these general remarks on the report of the Committee, we have a few words to say on special portions of that Report.

On pages 7 and 12 of the Report, Father Leclair is made to reply to Mr. Peter Redpath in these words:—"That he (Father Leclair) had no further evidence or witnesses whatever to offer." This had reference to the investigation of the Committee of Management. Now, this is incorrect both in sense and in form. Father Leclair's reply will be found on page 26, in these words: "I would be happy if the deliberation of the Committee should result in some arrangement that would give in future ample protection to the spiritual rights of all concerned; but I must decline to produce witnesses before the Committee. Doctor Cameron has made the Committee a party to this sad case, by stating that in his improper interference with me in the discharge of my ministry, he acted under orders." This is quite a different thing from the reply attributed to Father Leclair by the "Report." He does not say that "he had no further evidence or witnesses whatever to offer;" but he declines to produce any evidence or any witnesses whatever before the Committee, not because he had none to produce, but because he regarded the Committee as a party to the case, and consequently unfit to be judges, being by the fact totally disqualified, and rendered unworthy of confidence. At the time it was not known who amongst the members of the Committee gave the

orders referred to. The testimony of Doctor Cameron lets out the secret. The orders were given by Mr. Peter Redpath, President of the Hospital, and a member of the Committee; and Mr. Alexander, Chairman of the Committee. Pretty Judges indeed, to invite the production of evidence against themselves, which, in self-defence, they would be obliged to reject. These gentlemen showed better taste and a more correct sense of justice, when, subsequently, they declined to sit on the Governors' Committee; see page 8. The three letters of Father Dowd were already in the hands of the Committee. It cannot surprise any body that these documents with their important facts were entirely ignored. Men on self-defence will do strange things.

A personal question is introduced, page 10, which seems to have troubled the gentlemen of the Committee very much. The honor of their medical official was in jeopardy, and his zealous services in the cause of proselytism should be rewarded by white washing his reputation at any cost. With this object in view the evidence placed before the Committee of Management on the 10th of January, was sent to Father Leclair, who, after the perusal of the evidence, was asked, "if he considered he was right in charging Doctor Cameron, as set out in one of Father Dowd's letters, with having told a falsehood." Father Leclair's answer is thus reported on the same page:—"The documents submitted by the St. Patrick's Congregation contained his justification for what he had stated, and that his opinion remained unchanged."

After a careful examination of all the documents, we also are of opinion that the statement of the Rev. Gentleman is clearly and fully warranted. The accusation against Dr. Cameron was not that he told a lie, that he stated what he knew to be untrue. Between Gentlemen such a charge would be a case of Pistols. The accusation in its plain grammatical sense amounts to this and to nothing more,—that Dr. Cameron stated what was not true. Here is what the Doctor said,—"that the patient (McEntyre) had seen his minister for about five minutes with two other witnesses, and that he was satisfied to remain in the faith he always had;" see evidence of Father Leclair, page 75. Now, does the evidence produced on behalf of the St. Patrick's Congregation, justify Father Leclair in stating, that this assertion of Dr. Cameron was not the fact? It is evident it does. We will give a few of the leading facts proved on oath, that relate to this point.

During two years before his last sickness, McEntyre never entered a Protestant Church; generally attended services in St. Patrick's Church; abstained from meat on Fridays, and blessed himself as a Catholic; over and over again he declared to his most intimate friends, that he would never die a Protestant, in his last sickness he sent freely, without control or suggestion, for Father Leclair; to whom he declared his desire to enter the Catholic Church; he received instruction, and was prepared to make his Confession, (a rather sharp test of sincerity for a Scotch Presbyterian.) Father Leclair perfectly convinced of McEntyre's sincerity, was ready to admit him to the Catholic Church.

Then all at once Dr. Cameron declares that McEntyre wished to remain a Presbyterian. Five minutes conversation with the minister upset the fixed intention of years; annulled the promises so often made to bosom friends, and belied all the professions of sincerity made, only a few hours before, in the most solemn manner, on the bed of death, to the priest himself. Was this credible? Should Father Leclair be expected to believe such a paradox on the word of any man? We say distinctly, no. And yet Dr. Cameron had the modesty to look for this homage from Father Leclair.

On three different occasions the Rev. gentleman requested to be allowed to hear the truth from McEntyre himself, in presence of the Doctor and of two witnesses of the Doctor's choice. This most reasonable and proper request was three times refused! Shame Doctor! Such conduct obliges us to say what Father Leclair did not say—the Doctor must have known that McEntyre was not changed, and that he only awaited the presence of his chosen pastor to carry out the resolution of years. This is the only supposition that can reasonably explain the indecorum of such a refusal to any minister of religion.

This is not all. As the minister was withdrawing from the ward after his first visit to McEntyre, the sick man said to his intended wife,—"That is the minister, I don't want him." (See evidence of Mary McGuire, page 70.) Must Father Leclair be subjected to rude and insulting treatment by the authorities of the Hospital, because he preferred the oath of a virtuous and respectable young female to the interested assertion of Doctor Cameron? Is not this direct proof that the dispositions of McEntyre were not changed at the time the Doctor said they were?

Four days later, we have the sworn testimony of two unimpeachable witnesses that McEntyre still longed to see Father Leclair. "Father Leclair knows my mind; he will be the first man to put hands over me when I get round." Does not this language affirm in the most positive manner that McEntyre did not change his mind even after four days visits of the minister; and that his wishes remained what they were when he first sent for Father Leclair, and prepared to make his confession to him. It seems to us more than proved, that Father Leclair was fully warranted in believing and affirming that the statement of Doctor Cameron was not true.

On page 13 of the Report we meet this singular argument:—Because McEntyre declared himself a Presbyterian on entering the Hospital, therefore there can be no grounds for charging the officials of the Hospital of an attempt to proselytise in favor of Protestantism. A short reply will suffice for this silly argument. McEntyre entered the Hospital as a Presbyterian; but whilst in the Hospital he changed his mind, as he had a right to do, and wished to become a Catholic; but Doctor Cameron would not allow him. What is this but rank proselytism in favor of Protestantism?

A word or two on some remarkable omissions in the Report. There is no remedy suggested for the intolerable nuisance of tract-mongers which is an unceasing cause of irritation and annoyance to the Catholic patients in every ward of the Hospital.