

that true repentance has taken place." The priest and the Catholic Church are blamed, however, for not assuming that she was penitent and for not according to her Christian burial.

The Catholic Church refuses Christian burial to those who die in the act of very grievous sin, unless they give some signs, at least, of sorrow. This does not imply that the person dying is lost eternally; but it implies that we have no outward proof that they are sorry for the wickedness of which they have been guilty. As in the case in point, the priest did not grant Christian burial, we may reasonably infer that the deceased did not give signs of repentance, though the writer of the article imagines she was penitent. The giving of Christian burial is an outward act, which depends upon the outward acts of the deceased, and it is very proper this should be the case. The main object is to deter others from the commission of grievous sins, which entail such a penalty, and to mark the Church's detestation of the sin. Yet it does not necessarily imply that the deceased died impenitent and was therefore lost eternally.

The editor of the *Review* is also wrong in saying that the soul is absolutely lost, according to the doctrine of the Church, unless confession be made and absolution be granted. It is true that in ordinary cases there must be confession and absolution, because Christ made the law. To His Apostles He gave the power of binding and loosing. (St. Matthew, xvi, 19; xviii, 18.) But the Catholic Church expressly teaches that when it is not possible to make a confession, perfect contrition reconciles the sinner to God. In proof of this permit me to quote the Catechism:

Q. Will perfect contrition reconcile us to God when we cannot go to confession? A. Yes; and it is the only means we have to recover God's friendship when we cannot go to confession.

It will be seen from these remarks that the article in the *Niagara Falls Review* was written by one utterly ignorant of Catholic doctrine, notwithstanding his dogmatism in settling all controversies on matters of faith.

Yours truly,
April 1, 1890. FAIR PLAY.

MR. MEREDITH'S NO-POPEY CRUSADE.

Mr. Meredith, having taken upon himself the character of leader of a no-Popey party, seems determined to stop short of no absurdity in order to play his part to perfection. On the motion made on the 4th inst. to go into committee on supply the leader of the Opposition made a motion which was intended as a direct insult to the Catholic body, and especially to the hierarchy of Ontario. This amendment was as follows:

"That this House do declare that the rights guaranteed by the B. N. A. Act to the supporters of Separate or Dissentient schools are civil rights appertaining to them as citizens, and that the assumption that any Church organization or body or the Bishops, priests, or ministers thereof, are entitled to control the ratepayers in the exercise and enjoyment of such, his individual right, or to command obedience to its or their direction; by them or by the trustees of any such schools, in the exercise by them of such rights or the performance by them of the duties delegated to them by the State, is wholly unwarranted and dangerous to the State and ought to be resisted, and this House doth further declare that it is within the constitutional rights of the Legislature through the Department of Education to regulate such schools and particularly to prescribe the text-books to be used in them, and that the said Department ought in the exercise of that right to make provisions regulating the text-books to be used in the said schools, except those employed in giving religious instruction, when and where such instruction is permitted by law."

This resolution, if intended to be taken seriously, would have been made in some other form than as a want-of-confidence motion on the question of supply. Could not Mr. Meredith have brought it up as a motion in such a form that the House would have had the opportunity of expressing its real sentiments on the question, instead of moving substantially that the Catholic Bishops and priests exercise an undue control over Catholic school matters, in such a form that no amendment could be offered? Or could he not have introduced a bill to prevent such interference? If he had done either of these things it would have been no less absurd than what he actually did, but at least he would have shown that he had the courage of his convictions, instead of showing the white feather by bringing up his ridiculous secessions in such a form that there could be no serious debate upon them. It is because Mr. Meredith has been already roughly handled in debate that he took this method of getting some Kentish fire cheaply in the way of approbatory resolutions from Orange Lodges? Mr. Meredith knows perfectly well that the law gives no special power to Bishops or priests in regard to the schools. It is therefore a wanton insult to the whole Catholic body to drag in their respected names in the manner that gentleman has done, and unless we much mistake the temper of our fellow Catholics, Mr. Meredith will find to his cost that they will resent it. Catholics have sense enough to know and spirit enough to resent an insult offered them, and still more an insult offered to the hierarchy and clergy.

We could inform Mr. Meredith of some clergyman who met in Toronto last June and passed resolutions which were merely intended to influence a few dissentient school elections but to dictate a policy for the whole Dominion, and especially to excite Ontario against the Province of Quebec. That meeting attempted to force the Governor General to put his veto on the advice of his constitutional advisers; and we are assured that the leaven of that meeting is still at work. If Mr. Meredith is so anxious to limit the influence of the clergy, why does he not introduce legislation to restrict the meddling parsons like Drs. Will, Austin, Hunter and Carman? We could tell him also of localities in Ontario where Protestant clergy, especially those of the Methodist body, openly attempt to control both Municipal and Parliamentary elections. Why does he not try to legislate against such interference as this?

We presume he is of the opinion that Catholics will submit tamely to his insults, and we are sorry to see that he has been encouraged in this view by at least one Catholic, the only one who supported him in this insulting motion, Mr. Clancy, M. P. for West Kent.

The school laws give no power to the Catholic clergy, but the Catholic people recognize that the clergy, and especially the Bishops, are the guardians and patrons of Catholic education, and willingly take their advice in the conduct of the Catholic schools. Protestant clergymen are often consulted as to the management of educational matters too; but we shall not deny that Catholics have greater respect for their priesthood than Protestants usually have for their ministers—perhaps because they better deserve it. But this does not justify Mr. Meredith's uncalculated insult.

Notwithstanding that it is our desire, as far as Catholic interests will permit, to abstain from taking sides in the political issues of the Dominion and the Province of Ontario, we would be derelict to our duty were we to let pass without comment Mr. Meredith's intolerant course. For the same reason we feel bound to acknowledge the straightforward honesty of Hon. Mr. Mowat in rebuking Mr. Meredith on the occasion to which we refer.

Mr. Mowat said: "The resolution of the hon. member had a good deal to say as to the hierarchy not being entitled to control the ratepayers. It suggested that law as recognized by the Government gave to the hierarchy such a power, but the fact was entirely otherwise. The law gave no power whatever in the matter to bishop or priest. The power was given to the ratepayers and supporters of Separate schools. Bishop or priest had no more power under the law in the matter of Separate schools than a layman had. The degree of deference or obedience which the Roman Catholic laity gave was for themselves to their bishop or priest, and was in no way connected with the ratepayers' duty or conscience required. It was not founded on any law of the Legislature. No law had given it, and, if a Roman Catholic chose to render what he might think an excessive amount of deference or obedience, no law which could be made would prevent his doing so. Mr. Meredith and all his party knew perfectly that nobody on the Government side of the House would favor a law giving to bishops or clergy any control over the laity. It must always be a matter of their own choice."

It is right that the Catholics of the Province should note particularly those who have supported Mr. Meredith throughout his anti-Catholic crusade. The following was the division on this last manifestation of no-Popey spleen:

Yes—Messrs. Blyth, Caldwell, Clancy, Craig, Creighton, Cruick, French, Ham, Mack, Hies, Hudson, Ingram, Keen, Lias, Martier, Maccham, Meredith, Met, Ost, Miller, Monk, Morgan, O'Connor, Ostrom, Preston, Korke, Smith, (Frontenac) Stewart, Tooley, Whitney, Willoughby, Wood (Hastings). Wylie—31.

Nays—Messrs. Allan, Armstrong, Atwey, Ballantyne, Bishop, Blesard, Calaboun, Clarke (Wellington), Connors, Dack, Dancy, Davis, Drury, Dryden, Evansville, Ferguson, Field, Fraser, Freeman, Garson, Gibson (Hamilton), Gibson (Huron), Gilmour, Gould, Graham, Harcourt, Hardy, Lys, Lyon, McAndrew, McKy, McLaughlin, McMahon, Mack, MacKenzie, Morin, Mowat, O'Connor, Phelps, Robillard, Ross (Huron), Ross (Middlesex), Smith (York), Souter, Sprague, Stratton, Watters, Wood (Brant)—49.

"SINGING ON THE KNEES" A CATHOLIC PRACTICE.

TO THE EDITOR—In Saturday's *Globe* there is a report of an investigation in regard to the trouble of the Church of England at Orilla. Mr. Hall, in his cross-examination by Mr. Seadling, is reported to have made a statement that will be new to Catholics, viz., "That he believed singing on the knees savored of Romanism."

I have never yet witnessed any "singing on the knees" in Catholic churches where there is congregational singing, and I will feel very thankful to you, and it will also be of general interest to your readers, if you will reply in the RECORD as to whether it is practiced in any country, or is it another display of ignorance in regard to Catholic doctrine and practices, so common among our separated brethren, particularly those who have a horror of anything that "savors of Romanism?"

CATHOLICS.

Wingham, April 7, 1890.

Dr. Morgan Grace, Senator of New Zealand, the brother of Hon. Wm. R. Grace, ex Mayor of New York, and of Michael, P. Grace, the extensive Peruvian railway contractor and builder, having been honored by the Holy Father by being appointed count of the Holy Roman Empire, was made the recipient of a grand banquet by the leading Catholics of New Zealand in commemoration of the event. Archbishop Redwood and other dignitaries assisted on the occasion.

"A SIGNIFICANT OPINION."

Under the above title the *Empire* of Saturday last quotes from last week's *Irish Canadian* a sentence in reference to the debate on Separate schools which took place in the Ontario Legislature, an account of which will be found in another column. The *Irish Canadian* on this expresses itself:

"The debate on the whole was characterized with moderation and dignity; and its most prominent feature—to many Catholics at least—were the ballot and the teaching qualification test, which we think Mr. Mowat should have conceded. There is something repulsive in denying to Catholics rights and privileges freely granted to Protestants. Both should, in our judgment, be placed in this respect, and in every other respect, on the most perfect equality before the law."

The *Empire* says in commenting on these words:

"These views, as coming from such a well known organ of Roman Catholic opinion, are especially significant, for they show that, notwithstanding what may be done as to rousing Roman Catholic electors and consolidating them in a solid phalanx against Mr. Meredith (and no doubt the attempt in that direction now being made will be to a large extent successful) intelligent men of that faith cannot help recognizing that his policy is in their true interest, and it certainly is in the interest of the community at large."

We have maintained, and we still maintain, that the "solid phalanx" of Catholic voters of which Mr. Wm. Meredith spoke in his address in the London Opera House, is a phantasm of his imagination. It is the fact that Catholic voters, whether in Ontario or any other Province of the Dominion, take different views of the politics of the country, and notwithstanding the decidedly no-Popey attitude which Mr. Meredith has taken, we are convinced that there are some Catholics who will shut their eyes to the fact that he has pandered to the no-Popey sentiment which certainly exists especially in Ontario.

We do not regard Mr. Meredith as a fanatic by conviction. But it is too evident to be denied that he has trimmed his sails to suit the no-Popey breeze which is now passing through the Province. Under pretence of taking a profound interest in the improvement of Catholic schools, he has adopted the policy of those who do not conceal their desire to abolish that system of education altogether. He can scarcely expect to receive Catholic support while pursuing such a course, and, indeed, from the moment he proclaimed that Catholics are the public enemy, against whom all Protestants should unite, he himself declared that he no longer expected Catholic support. What else is the meaning of the *Empire's* statement above quoted that Catholic electors have been consolidated into a solid phalanx against Mr. Meredith? A direct attack made against any denomination in the country would naturally consolidate the members of that denomination.

The *Irish Canadian*, from which the *Empire* quotes the passage given at the beginning of this article, cannot be regarded as representing Catholic opinion. We say it with regret, but respect for the truth compels us to make the statement.

We have before now given our opinion of the demand made for the ballot at school elections by a small minority of the Toronto Catholics. The purpose for which this demand has been made is sufficiently clear from the fact that those who most strongly insist upon the granting of the ballot are they who are the most pronounced enemies of Catholic education. The pretence is that the Catholic electors are intimidated by the clergy to elect clerical school trustees. We deny that any such intimidation exists, or has existed, at Catholic school elections, and we are indignant that any professing Catholics should encourage the enemies of Catholic education, by implying that there has been such intimidation. The Catholic electors have not experienced any intimidation, and the best proof that they do not desire any change in the method of voting is the fact that the agitators who advocated the ballot in Toronto were completely defeated at the polls at the last school elections in that city.

Another measure which is advocated by the *Irish Canadian* is that Religious Orders be subjected to the same examination as lay teachers that they may be legally qualified to teach. We are quite as anxious as any one can be to see efficient teachers in the Separate schools; but as we are aware that in the religious communities those who are appointed as teachers are carefully trained for the purpose, we do not deem it necessary that their fitness should be pronounced upon by the Central Board of Examiners. It is reasonable to suppose that ladies who devote their whole life to the teaching profession may be as well or better qualified to teach than those who adopt the profession merely for a few years—until they get married.

On March 31st St. Joseph's Catholic Convent, Milwaukee, was burned, the seventy-five occupants barely escaping. Sister Blunker jumped from a fourth story window, and was fatally hurt. Two candidates jumped from the third story, and were seriously injured. Two firemen were injured. Loss \$70,000.

RANDY'S REBUKE.

HIS SPEECH DENOUNCING THE SALISBURY-TIMES PIGROT CABAL.

THE COMMISSION AN ILLEGAL BODY—ITS FINDINGS UNFAIR, PARTISAN AND COMPLETE—THE SORRIES WARNED OF THE DANGERS AHEAD—WHY WAS NOT THE TIMES CENSURED?—A BRILLIANT STATEMENT OF THE CASE.

The speech which Lord Randolph Churchill delivered in the House of Commons on the occasion of the final vote upon the forgeries report was one of the features of the debate. The cabal abstract which we were able to furnish our readers contained only those impassioned and denunciatory portions of the address, which showed the recalcitrant Tory's bitter hostility to the Salisbury Government. But the speech, as a whole, contained the strongest arguments against the whole procedure that we have yet seen. And for this reason we reproduce it now from the columns of the *Dublin Freeman's Journal*. After his introductory statement Lord Randolph Churchill came to the conduct of the government in persecuting the Unconstitutionality Bill. The first step, he said, of a government proud of being a constitutional government, was to ascertain the truth of criminal charges against individuals, and not only against individuals but against political opponents—was to discard and set aside the ordinary law of the land. What was the second step? That the Government decided to constitute by means of an Act of Parliament a special commission consisting of three judges of the law and three judges who were to accumulate the functions of judge and jury for the purpose of trying individuals on a criminal charge. That is to say, the government decided to try their political opponents on a criminal charge without giving them the protection of a jury. (Hear, hear.) I attach enormous importance to this, for what our government may lawfully do in dealing with political opponents another government may hereafter do without illegality. The third step was that, having compelled the then political opponents to stand their trial on a criminal charge, the executive of the day proceeded themselves to nominate the members of that tribunal. The members of the tribunal, when placed on trial on a criminal charge, has a large voice in the selection of a jury. He has a considerable right of challenge, but in these proceedings the British government allowed the individuals placed on their trial, who were political opponents, NO VOICE IN THE SELECTION OF A JURY AND NO CHALLENGE.

(Cheers.) Suppose you tell me that this was not a criminal trial, but a proceeding in the nature of arbitration, then I ask whether you have heard of an arbitration where one of the parties had no voice in the selection of the arbitrators who were to decide. (Cheers.) The fourth step, which was the natural consequence of the three first, was that the government, after forcing these proceedings through the House, inflicted, in anticipation of the finding, a heavy penalty upon their political opponents in the shape of a large pecuniary fine. A considerable amount of injustice, and very gross injustice, was the consequence of such an act, because by the effect which the government had made to the Irish party in 1887 to commence a criminal prosecution against the newspaper which had made those charges, in the name of the law officers and at the public cost the government had indicated very clearly that, in their view at the time, it was not right or fair that the Irish party should be put to heavy and considerable cost in asserting the truth of these charges. But by the proceedings under the special commission act you have leveled upon your political opponents a fine which I am informed on good authority amounts to something close on £40,000. I assert—and I defy any lawyer to contradict me—that for not one of these proceedings, or for all of them taken as a whole, can you find

PRECEDENT OR PARALLEL IN ENGLISH HISTORY. or anything approaching or approximating to such a proceeding. (Cheers.) And I declare that not within the last century or century and a half has any public man been exposed to such a trial and such a cost as the honorable member for Cork and his friends have been exposed to. The bill to create this unconstitutional commission was hurried through under closure of the most arbitrary and brutal form of character. These are the proceedings we are called on to sanction this night. It is a proceeding that would have been gladly resorted to by the Tudors or the Stuarts. It is, I think, in every sense of the word, an Elizabethan proceeding. (Cheers.) It is a procedure of an arbitrary and tyrannical nature against individuals who are the political opponents of the government of the day—a procedure such as Parliament for centuries and generations struggled against, a procedure which we hoped that in these happy days Parliament had overcome. It is a procedure which would have considerably alarmed Lord Eldon, against which Lord Brougham and Lord Lyndhurst would alike have protested, and which, if the great lawyer, Lord Cairns, had lived, the Tory party would never have resorted to. (Cheers.) But a Nemesis attends a government which adopts unconstitutional courses. What has been the result of all this? Pigrot. (Loud cheers from the Irish members.) In the same fate will, I hope, attend every British government that departs from an constitutional course. I have said that the motion is a sanction of proceedings of illegality by the Act of Parliament appointing the commission. THE GOVERNMENT VIOLATED THE CONSTITUTION.

And by this motion I hold they are violating their own law. To these charges were delegated the function of Parliament to inquire into the truth of these charges. The judgment of the commissioners was to be final so far as the House of Commons was concerned. That was undeniably so, because by the terms of the act the tribunal set up had conferred upon it all the powers, rights, and privileges of a high court of justice, or any judge thereof. The first and most essential

privilege of a high court of justice is that its proceedings in the administration of the law shall not be interfered with by Parliament; shall not be brought under the review of Parliament, either for the purpose of blame or praise, and that its findings and its judgments cannot under any circumstances whatever be questioned in Parliament. In the administration of the law the high court of justice is co-equal with Parliament. By this motion, however, the House of Commons is asked to constitute itself a court of review of the findings of a tribunal with equal rights and equal privileges. If the Irish members were to attempt to bring under the review of the House proceedings of the high court of justice, such an attempt would be sternly rejected, but now we have a British government inviting the House of Commons to confirm the judgment of the high court of justice, and naturally inviting and challenging their opponents to reject the judgment. If this motion is adopted I assert upon high legal authority that there is hardly any judgment or finding of any judge or jury administering the law in the high court which may not be brought under the notice of Parliament either to be questioned, adopted or condemned.

What is to become of the administration of justice in this country? How are you to look for an independent judiciary if the findings and the judgment of judges are to be subjected to a parliamentary debate, to censure or approval? What is to become of the administration of justice if the judgments of the high court are to be adopted by a party majority when they happen to be convenient (cheers), and be rejected when they happen to be inconvenient or troublesome? If the judges had delivered their judgment in their own court, I maintain the unconstitutionality of the motion of the right honorable gentlemen would have been apparent to the meanest intellect. Furthermore, the first lord of the treasury says he wishes to do absolute justice to all. Let us examine that proposition. He asks the House of Commons to adopt the report, and if we do so make the report our own we condemn certain persons on certain charges, and we acquit them on others. But is we condemn all the guilty parties concerned in this matter? (Opposition cheers.) Do we condemn all the parties who, to use a mild expression, have been guilty of misdemeanor? We condemn, it is true, the Irish members on certain charges. But we do condemn the *Times* newspaper, which has been found to be

GUILTY OF AN ATROCIOUS LIE. upon members of the House? There is not a word in your report or in the motion condemning the convicted delinquent, the *Times*. Can you call that dealing out absolute justice to all? If the Government insist upon this motion, if they compel their majority to assent to this (Opposition cheers), I shall defend upon any right as a member of the House, to record my vote in favor of the condemnation, not only of the Irish party, but of the *Times*, found guilty of an atrocious libel upon members of the House—found guilty of a slander unexampled, and without foundation (cheers); and I heartily counsel honorable gentlemen on this side of the House, even at the eleventh hour, to do something towards retracting the steps they have taken along a very dangerous road. I wish them to press the Government to abandon this motion. There was a time, not very long ago, when my words had some weight with honorable gentlemen on this side of the House, in recalling the time I cannot, and I will not try to refrain from the remark that the prospects of the party then were brighter than they are now. When I had the honor to be one of the chief counselors of honorable gentlemen the Unionist majority in the House was over 100.

THE UNIONIST MAJORITY. now has fallen to about seventy; and it cannot be denied that by elections, though dangerous if you gather too much deduction from one or from two, as a whole show a great shifting of public opinion, which I fear will not be favorable to the prospects of the Unionist party. If my words have fallen upon deaf ears, if the counsels which I most humbly submit are to be spurned and scorned, then I declare that I, with the honorable and learned member for Fife, look forward to the day when a future Parliament shall expunge from the journals of this House the records of this melancholy proceeding (Opposition cheers), and shall administer its proper punishment to the delinquent and wholehearted rebuke for having outraged and violated constitutional liberty, and set up a sign-post full of warning, of instruction and of guidance to the Parliaments yet unborn. (Loud Opposition cheers.)

THE LATE MR. BIGGAR.

Mr. Wm. O'Brien refers to the death of Mr. Biggar in the following pathetic words, picturing the great loss which Ireland experiences in the death of the patriotic Nationalist, M. P.:

"The sorest personal affliction that has befallen the Irish people for long is the tidings that faithful, fearless Joe Biggar is no more. Every Irish heart will be wrung with intimate personal grief for him who is gone. His colleagues all but idolized him with an affection that only those who knew him at close quarters could altogether understand, but the whole Irish race instinctively recognized in him a type of that stubborn, unflinching spirit which raised the Irish cause from a slough of Parliamentary apathy and corruption to the proud position and ascendancy it enjoys to day in the British Parliament."

By his will Mr. Biggar, it is stated, has left a legacy of £1,000 to the nuns of the convent of Mercy, Louisa; £1,000 to the Sisters of Mercy, Belfast; and £1,000 to St. Patrick's College, Cavan. Truly he was a man who "loved his country and served his kind."—*Irish News*.

As a result of the Catholic successes in the Bavarian elections, the Government has opened negotiations with the hierarchy for the settlement of all questions at issue between Church and State.

Mrs. Donovan, a non-Catholic recently deceased at Baltimore, has left Cardinal Gibbons and his archdiocesan successors \$10,000 investment for the education of candidates for the priesthood.

OBITUARY.

Margaret Conlon, London.

Died, on Monday, the 31st ult., at the residence of her uncle, Mr. J. B. Murphy, this city, Margaret, daughter of the late Patrick Conlon, formerly of Toronto. Miss Conlon has from childhood lived with her relatives in this city. By her amiable disposition and the constant practice of every Christian virtue she won the profound esteem and unreserved love not only of those with whom she was closely associated in her every day life and domestic relations, but appreciation of her excellent qualities and kindly traits of character extended to a very large circle of friends. She was twenty-three years of age when the insidious ravages of consumption deprived her of life. As she was a constant attendant at every service of the Church, and was numbered among the most devout of the children of Mary, she was fully prepared when the final summons came. After being fully cleansed from all human frailties and fortified with the last sacraments of the Church, she resignedly and joyfully committed her pure soul to the hands of Him who redeemed her. On Wednesday the funeral proceeded to St. Peter's cathedral where High Mass of Requiem was celebrated and a very touching sermon preached by the Rev. Father Tierman. A large concourse of sympathizing friends were in attendance who mourned her loss and prayed earnestly for eternal rest to her soul.

Maurice Dalton, Ashfield.

Your prayers are requested for the repose of the soul of Maurice Dalton, who died this morning. Such were the words that fell from the lips of our pastor, Father Bourke, as he turned to his congregation on Palm Sunday. The sad news was indeed true. Although his death had been expected for some time, still the tidings told like a heavy cloud upon the hearts of his many friends in the church. He had been ailing for a number of years, and latterly he failed very rapidly until at last he succumbed to a violent hemorrhage of the lungs. He was only twenty-two years of age. Sad indeed is it to see one so young thus torn away from loving parents and fond brothers and sisters. Hard it must be for those friends to resign themselves to the departure of one who fell a victim to too eager ambition to advance the material interests of the family. A ways patient in his sufferings, he never complained but waited calmly for the end and died a happy and easy death fully confident in the mercy of his Redeemer. It is to be hoped he found favor with his Heavenly Father, and although for the present he may be debarred from the enjoyment of the Blessed Sight, we console ourselves in the reflection that the earnest prayers of his many friends to the throne of mercy may speedily shorten his time of probation and that he may soon be admitted to the company of God, His angels and His saints.

Mr. John Larkin, London.

Mr. John Larkin, of this city, died on Friday, 4th inst., after an illness of two weeks duration. He was one of the oldest members of the police force, having joined in June, 1855, and was always considered one of the most trustworthy officers in the service, and not only this, but was very highly esteemed by a large circle of friends and acquaintances because of a noble and kindly nature. At the time of his death he was sixty-two years of age, and leaves a widow, four daughters and three sons to mourn his loss. The funeral took place on Sunday afternoon last, at St. Peter's Cathedral, where the usual solemn offices for the dead was performed by Rev. Father Tierman, who delivered a touching and practical discourse on the occasion, making special reference to the good life led by the earnest and practical Catholic whose remains were now about to be committed to mother earth. The city police force, under command of Chief Williams, formed a guard of honor to send from the Cathedral. After the service in which was concluded the funeral, which was a very large one, proceeded to St. Peter's cemetery, where the interment took place. *Requiescat in pace.*

Daniel Burk, La Salette.

Death has been unusually busy of late in the parish of La Salette. On March 28th ult., Daniel Burk, one of the oldest and most respected citizens of La Salette departed this life at the venerable age of ninety-eight years. His funeral took place on the 31st ult. The pastor, Rev. P. Corcoran, paid a beautiful tribute to the memory of the departed. He said the deceased came from Ireland and was forced from the home of his nativity by the misgovernment which made it impossible for the population to earn a livelihood; but by his honesty, industry and sobriety he acquired for himself a competency and left to his family the example of a good Christian life.

Mrs. McNamara and Michael McNamara.

On Good Friday morning Mrs. McNamara, wife of Michael McNamara, and her son Michael, aged thirty years, died within a few hours of each other. Mrs. McNamara was seventy-four years old and had been sick for some time. Mr. McNamara leaves a wife and four small children, who have the sympathy of the whole community. The funerals of the mother and son took place on Easter Sunday, proceeding to the church of La Salette, and after Mass was celebrated the funeral service was read by the Rev. P. Corcoran, who also spoke feelingly of the sad event of the double sorrow, and drew therefrom the lesson of the instability of earthly things, and the importance of attending to the one thing necessary, the serving of God.

According to *Les Missions Catholiques* there are in Africa two Archbishops and thirteen Episcopal Seats, twenty-three Vicariates Apostolic, and eighteen Prefectures. Besides French, Spanish, Italian, English and Portuguese secular clergy, the following religious orders have missions established in diverse parts of the Dark Continent: the Franciscans, Jesuits, Alger Fathers, Capuchins, Lazarists, Fathers of the Holy Ghost, Benedictines, Oblates, African Mission Fathers and Fathers of de Scheut.