

London, has for all enjoys, an en- gaging out ordered large experience this regard en- tant tailors. He personally in- ing for the purpose and most suit- This season his French Broad- id comprises not r clergy men, but which will enable as advantageous as any house in

SWORTH, ILORS.

Revere House,



& CO.

ing sales for will give to Dry Goods amount of iver, Stem goods never see.

& CO.

VE HOUSE.

AD:

ESSENT.

ADINGS will riter to form a is great work. Founded by out 312 years

ND.—Arising rity to glorify h commenced

of SAINTS.— virtues of such women as the and the noble the years suc- nary centuries d of Christian

ON, A. D. 795, rying fortunes I, I. A. D. 1072, Ireland finally the Monarch er are recalled

Brave, whose f in A. D. 1014 Vikings, and ng to be called

N INVASION,

A. D. 1525, oc- history. A. D. 1782.

ATION, A. D.

MENT, A. D.

NDITION OF THE LAND

and 1882.

ION, August

CHY.—Their

TILES OF IM-

apter fills 91

of the PENAL

ND, by James

nscribed in one octavo, green gnt gold de- and contains

IRELAND

ES. \$3.50.

YWHERE.

y mail on re-

R & CO

ME ST.,

L.

QEMS!

Price 25. 00. Sent

Price. London, Ont.

The Catholic Record.

"CHRISTIANUS MIHI NOMEN EST, CATHOLICUS VERO COGNOMEN."—"CHRISTIAN IS MY NAME, BUT CATHOLIC MY SURNAME"—St. Pacian, 4th Century.

VOL. 6.

FOR THE WEEK ENDING SATURDAY, JULY 26, 1884.

NO. 302

CLERICAL.

We make a specialty of Clerical Suits, and turn out better fitting and better finished garments than any Western House. N. Wilson & Co., 136 DUNDAS STREET

Written for the "Catholic Record." A Farewell.

Fare-you-well, fare you well, House by the silvery rocks; Happy may your inmates dwell, While not, memory mocks; Many a time with blithesome heart Have I your school passed; Sadly now I will depart, For it is the last.

Fare ye well, fare ye well, Friends who have turned cold, Ye would not bear the ordeal well, The test that trieth gold. Yet with levery happiness, Affection fond and true, And every blessing, none the less, In bidding ye adieu.

Fare ye well, fare ye well, Friends I have not to bid adieu; Did oceans wide between us well I were less lonely here, A despot gulf between us lies, No bridge from shore to shore, Ains for human destinies, We meet, we meet no more.

LITURGY.

The Prayers ordered to be said after every Low Mass by the Pope.

REV. SIR—Will you kindly give us, Missionary Priests, your valuable opinion in a matter affecting the correctness and uniformity of our public service. I refer to the prayers lately ordered by the Holy Father to be said after every Low Mass.

1. In some places those prayers are said before the *De Profundis*, but the more general usage is to say them after it. Which practice is right?

2. Some priests stand when saying the prayer, "O God, our refuge and our strength," but the greater number say it kneeling. Which is the correct way?

3. In some churches the people are encouraged to join in saying the Holy Mary in response to the "Hail Mary" by the priest; but generally the Mass server only answers, and the congregation is not invited to join. Which course should be adopted?

4. Finally, what of the "Hail, Holy Queen?" is this to be said by the priest only, or is the congregation to join in this prayer also?

In the cause of correctness and uniformity, I ask for your decision. A VICAR.

1.—It is our opinion that the prayers to which you refer, and which were ordered by a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Rites (Jan. 20th, 1884), at the express desire of the Holy Father, should be said before the *De Profundis*. Our reason for saying so is because they are liturgical prayers. They are as strictly liturgical as a Collect ordered by the Pope or S. Congregation—the difference being that the Collect is a part of the liturgy to be said in the Mass, but those prayers form the part of the liturgy to be said after Mass ("peracto Missæ sacrificio"). As such, they take precedence of all other prayers after Mass, which have not this liturgical character; and the *De Profundis*, though made obligatory by custom in this country, and sanctioned by the Synod of Maynooth, is not a liturgical prayer.

2.—It has come to our knowledge that so strictly liturgical are those prayers after Mass, that the Roman authorities will not now them to be said in French, or English, or any language but Latin, without the gravest cause and the permission of the S. Congregation.

3.—Seeing that the prayers are strictly liturgical, the Oration "*Deus, refugium et virtus*," should be said by the priest standing, just as he says the prayer at Benediction and similar functions standing. This is the practice of Rome where those prayers have been in use since an early date in the reign of Pius IX.

4.—The congregation, and not the mere Mass servers, should answer the "Hail Mary." The object of the Pope is to get the priest and people to join in public prayer for the necessities of the Church: "Ut quod Christianæ reipublice in commune expedit, id communi prece populus Christianus a Deo contendant, acutoque supplicanti numero, divina beneficia misericordiae facilius assequatur."

It is certainly the duty of the priest to instruct the people how to answer those prayers and to encourage them to join in answering the Holy Mary.

IV.—It is the unvarying practice of Rome for the people as well as the priest, to say the *Sole Regina*; and the practice in common use for so many years, is our best and safest model to follow.

We should remark here that one of the obvious results of the liturgical character of those prayers is that we should strictly adhere to the form of prayer prescribed, neither adding to it nor taking from it. Hence we should not say the *Gloria Patri* after the *Hail Marys*, nor the *Divinum Auctum* at the end.

It is obviously most desirable and indeed necessary, as you remark, that in saying those prayers which are now made a permanent part of our public service, uniformity of practice should be observed, not only through all the dioceses of Ireland, but with all parts of the universal Church. Of course our Bishops will in due time consider the matter and give us a practical decision for our guid-

ance regarding all the points you refer to in your letter. And we may not have to wait for this direction longer than next week, when their Lordships hold their summer meeting at Maynooth.

BISHOP JAMOT.

THE SCHOOL ENTERTAINMENT. The entertainment given in the new chapel attached to the Convent by the children of the Separate school yesterday, was of the most interesting kind, and proved a success beyond the anticipations of all. The children acquitted themselves, without exception, in the most perfect manner, and great praise is due those ladies to whom belongs the credit of such careful and efficient training. After the opening hymn the children presented an address of welcome to their Lordship Bishop Jamot, who responded. There were a large number of people present who thoroughly enjoyed the entertainment provided. The following is the programme:

- Hymn.....Veni Sancti By the Children.
- Duet.....J. L. Hickok. By Misses Hasking and LeMay.
- Song.....Just as I am. Miss McLean.
- Dialogue.....The Flowers. Una Clavet and Mary Coveny.
- Chorus.....Come Where the Lilies Blow. By the Children.
- Duet.....Charles Dreyer. Misses Fraser and Healy.
- Piano-forte Duet.....Una Clavet and Laura Connee.
- Song.....The Four-Leaved Shamrock. Miss M. Redden.
- Recitation.....Mother's Prayer. Nellie LeMay.
- Song.....Send the Little Ones Happy to Bed. Duet.....J. Ashir. Misses LeMay and Hasking.
- Song.....Drifting With the Tide. W. A. Drester. Misses Healy, Smith and Downey.
- Recitation.....Jane's Conquest. By the Fourth and Fifth Classes.
- Solo.....W. Pape. Miss I. McLean.
- Chorus.....Cuckoo. Undina Clavet and L. Connee.
- Duet.....Charles Blake. Misses McLean and Ferras.
- Hymn.....O Quam Delecta. God Save the Queen.

In the evening his Lordship the Bishop performed the baptismal ceremony of Laura Connee, Dr. O'Sullivan, of Peterboro and Miss Beatty, of Silver Islet, acting as godfather and godmother. To-morrow Bishop Jamot will be presented with an address after Mass by the members of the congregation, and in the afternoon Confirmation will be administered.—Port Arthur Daily Sentinel, July 12.

HIS LORDSHIP PRESENTED WITH AN ADDRESS ON SUNDAY LAST. Port Arthur Herald, July 17.

HIS LORDSHIP BISHOP JAMOT was presented with the following address by the congregation of St. Andrew's Church, of this town, after High Mass last Sunday, the beautifully prepared document being read by Mr. Thomas Ryan:

To His Lordship the Right Reverend John Francis Jamot, Bishop of the Diocese of Peterborough.

MY LORD.—With sentiments of great pleasure and joy, we the Catholics of the Parish of Saint Andrew's, of Port Arthur, draw near to you to extend our most hearty welcome to this, one of our favorite parishes. To see you once again amongst us is a matter of heartfelt joy to your devoted flock of this parish. This feeling could arise from a personal magnetism and inspiration your presence amongst us causes, but in addition to that, we have many reasons to acquaint you of our profound respect and joy to see you here again. Your liberality to this parish has been proved frequently by so many valuable donations; your paternal solicitude for us, as evidenced in your numerous letters and visits, in spite of the distance which seems to separate us; every village, yea, even every household has cause to have profound joy in the remembrances of you, as following in the footsteps of the Missionaries of old, you dispensed the Spiritual blessings and peace to the members of such households in parts that seemed inaccessible, and surrounded with dangers and hardships that beset you.

Your Lordship will be so gracious as to allow us still further to assure you that this present visit is marked with a very peculiar interest to us. We have long been desirous of expressing to you the joy we have all felt upon hearing of the appointment of your Reverend and worthy self as the first titular Bishop of the Diocese of Peterborough. The extent of your field of labor, as Vicar Apostolic, surpasses the other Dioceses of this Province, but the addition of other portions taken from other Dioceses and placed under your ever kindly but masterly hands grants to you the administration of a field which your known indefatigable energy, boundless bounty and praiseworthy zeal, truly merits and deserves. We look upon the fact of the choice made by the Holy See of your person for this part portion of the Divine Vineyard, as confirming us in our belief, that the paternal heart is inexhaustible in its charity; and that, while embracing the general interests of the House of God, it knew how to keep a tender concern for all local benefits, even towards the comfort and suffering, joy and grief of every individual. With reference to individual recollections, many of us here can say how your loving words have come to us in times needed to encourage and

console. And so it is our joy, great indeed, to feel that your Lordship knows us as sheep of your flock and that amidst your many cares and solicitudes we have a share in your good and paternal heart.

United in heart and soul to your Lordship and thanking the Heavenly Father for the choicest of gifts with which He has endowed you; and acknowledging our indebtedness to Christ's Vicar, the illustrious Leo XIII., for the high dignity to which he has meritoriously exalted you, we pray in conclusion that you may be spared for many years to adorn the Episcopate by your learning and virtues, to continue rich in the love and affections of your people, and that you may be consoled by our fervent practice of Christian virtues; and that in the end the Crown of glory will be yours to your contentment joy and happiness.

And now we ask for the blessing of your Lordship upon ourselves and our families. Signed on behalf of the Parish of Saint Andrew's, Port Arthur. GEORGE CLAVET, J. P. THOMAS RYAN. DANIEL COVENY.

His Lordship replied at considerable length, thanking the congregation for their kind words and dealing generally with Catholic Church affairs in this district.

In the afternoon the Bishop administered the rite of Confirmation to thirty children and five adults.

SEAFORTH.

To the Editor of the Catholic Record:

DEAR SIR—Will you permit me, through the columns of the RECORD, to make some reflections on what has been said by the speakers at the Orange celebration held in Clinton on the 13th inst. The Catholics of Ontario, as may be seen from the report of the Orange celebration, are no less free from misrepresentation and calumny than are those of Ireland. The religious animosities which break the ties of unity between Protestants and Catholics in Ireland, and which, unfortunately, to some extent, exist in Canada, are gradually wearing away, but we can never hope for their total extinction while the Orange society exists, with such men at its head as Rev. Taylor, John White, Hewitt and Farrow.

Rev. Taylor in his speech puts it thus: "This is a great society, great because of its association with one who founded it, of glorious, pious and immortal memory, great because there were gathered round the Orange standard, in every part of the world, millions of good men and true, ever ready to celebrate the victories achieved in the past, and to defend their principles in the future. It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open opposition to history, and tells the intelligent people of this country that a society can be called great which holds dear the memory of the greatest slaughterer of innocent people and the foulest deeds which tarnish the pages of history, he is treating us in flowery terms, to a ludicrous store of his cherished bigotry. Can he call an association great, founded to commemorate the name of William, Prince of Orange, a man of gloomy temper, cold, distant, caring nothing for the cause he governed, but how he might enrich himself out of the spoils of the above quoted standpoints? It is, of course, the right sort of talk for an Orange speech, but when he (Taylor) stands up, in open

Written for the "Catholic Record."
First Communicant.

"Suffer the little children, O, bid them come to me!" Let them draw near my table in their childhood's purity...

have done that? No. That is one reason why in all the books written in her life very little was said of her cut of reverence, out of respect, or rather out of delicacy.

FOR THE SAKE OF THE CROSS, and redeemed by the cross, she was kept from all stain of sin. The angel Gabriel came to Mary, as the last angel, the serpent, came to that first woman, Eve.

FATHER W. ROBINSON ON "MAR-
IOLATRY."

London University, June 25.

On Sunday a very large congregation was present at the evening service in the Pro-Cathedral, Kensington, when, after solemn Vespers, the Rev. Walter Croke Robinson preached on the Catholic practice of devotion to the Blessed Virgin.

That charge is most unjust, and made either by people who are grossly ignorant or very wicked. I will endeavor to-night to show you, first, where the Catholic worship of the Virgin gives her, and for that purpose I shall take you to the Scriptures, and nowhere else.

PROTESTANTS ALWAYS WANT TO RUN ON. Don't get out of breath, but keep to this point: "between thy seed and her seed, shall be enmity." The serpent, and she shall be in wait for her heel."

nothing but the holy family growing up about them at Nazareth under the protection of the foster father, and Jesus the child. The Catholic Church is the expansion of the Holy Family throughout the world, in which Mary is the mother.

ONCE MORE COMES THE LEARNED PROTESTANT and says that our Lord addressed His mother as if to insult her. "He knew there was going to be such a thing as Mark 3:29."

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND JAMES JOSEPH CARBERY, Bishop of Hamilton.

This prelate of the Roman Catholic Church made his first official visit to Guelph on Saturday. His Lordship accompanied by Rev. Father Heenan, V. G., arrived by the 9 o'clock train in the morning.

WHAT DO WE GATHER FROM ALL THIS? Mary is the Mother of God. This little child in her arms is her son. What an awful mystery, you say. So do I. It is perfectly past our comprehension.

human immigration can bridge the distance; still she is the Mother of God, and the Church, therefore, gives her the highest respect and veneration. If you love and honour Jesus you must honour His mother.

nothing but the holy family growing up about them at Nazareth under the protection of the foster father, and Jesus the child. The Catholic Church is the expansion of the Holy Family throughout the world, in which Mary is the mother.

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND JAMES JOSEPH CARBERY, Bishop of Hamilton.

This prelate of the Roman Catholic Church made his first official visit to Guelph on Saturday. His Lordship accompanied by Rev. Father Heenan, V. G., arrived by the 9 o'clock train in the morning.

WHAT DO WE GATHER FROM ALL THIS? Mary is the Mother of God. This little child in her arms is her son. What an awful mystery, you say. So do I. It is perfectly past our comprehension.

consoling sight to see the youth of the congregation banded together in the cause of temperance. While there was so much good being done he was sorry to hear of some evil.

nothing but the holy family growing up about them at Nazareth under the protection of the foster father, and Jesus the child. The Catholic Church is the expansion of the Holy Family throughout the world, in which Mary is the mother.

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND JAMES JOSEPH CARBERY, Bishop of Hamilton.

This prelate of the Roman Catholic Church made his first official visit to Guelph on Saturday. His Lordship accompanied by Rev. Father Heenan, V. G., arrived by the 9 o'clock train in the morning.

WHAT DO WE GATHER FROM ALL THIS? Mary is the Mother of God. This little child in her arms is her son. What an awful mystery, you say. So do I. It is perfectly past our comprehension.

his charge, he had met with a most cordial welcome. Throughout the diocese the most cordial relations existed between the priests and the people.

nothing but the holy family growing up about them at Nazareth under the protection of the foster father, and Jesus the child. The Catholic Church is the expansion of the Holy Family throughout the world, in which Mary is the mother.

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND JAMES JOSEPH CARBERY, Bishop of Hamilton.

This prelate of the Roman Catholic Church made his first official visit to Guelph on Saturday. His Lordship accompanied by Rev. Father Heenan, V. G., arrived by the 9 o'clock train in the morning.

WHAT DO WE GATHER FROM ALL THIS? Mary is the Mother of God. This little child in her arms is her son. What an awful mystery, you say. So do I. It is perfectly past our comprehension.

our school in this village, and realize the advantages accruing to our child from their continuous zeal in this behalf.

For a quarter of a century good, pious and devoted priests, who never considered any labor too arduous, in the discharge of their duties and in attending to our spiritual wants—under whose fostering care this parish has expanded and flourished—have been our guides.

nothing but the holy family growing up about them at Nazareth under the protection of the foster father, and Jesus the child. The Catholic Church is the expansion of the Holy Family throughout the world, in which Mary is the mother.

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND JAMES JOSEPH CARBERY, Bishop of Hamilton.

This prelate of the Roman Catholic Church made his first official visit to Guelph on Saturday. His Lordship accompanied by Rev. Father Heenan, V. G., arrived by the 9 o'clock train in the morning.

WHAT DO WE GATHER FROM ALL THIS? Mary is the Mother of God. This little child in her arms is her son. What an awful mystery, you say. So do I. It is perfectly past our comprehension.

July 26, 1884. Kyrie. In joy and pain a father, Thy hand...

For them the stars no human words. For our earth's death. Breathe not, Thy hand in heaven they know. No father and no son.

nothing but the holy family growing up about them at Nazareth under the protection of the foster father, and Jesus the child. The Catholic Church is the expansion of the Holy Family throughout the world, in which Mary is the mother.

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND JAMES JOSEPH CARBERY, Bishop of Hamilton.

This prelate of the Roman Catholic Church made his first official visit to Guelph on Saturday. His Lordship accompanied by Rev. Father Heenan, V. G., arrived by the 9 o'clock train in the morning.

WHAT DO WE GATHER FROM ALL THIS? Mary is the Mother of God. This little child in her arms is her son. What an awful mystery, you say. So do I. It is perfectly past our comprehension.

Kyrie Eleison.

ADELAIDE PROCTOR.
In joy and pain and sorrow,
Father, Thy hand we see;
But some among Thy children,
Deny their faith and Thee.

BISHOP CLEARLY

VISITS ST. FINNAN'S PARISH, ALEXANDRIA, AND BLESSES THE CORNER-STONE OF THE NEW CHURCH—AN IMPOSING CEREMONY.

ALEXANDRIA, July 14, 1884.

On Saturday last His Lordship Bishop Clearly arrived here for the purpose of blessing the corner-stone of the new St. Finnan's Church, which is now in course of erection.

This being His Lordship's first visit to the parish since his return from Europe, he was welcomed enthusiastically and heartily.

On Saturday evening His Lordship, accompanied by Rev. Alex. McDonnell, Rev. J. S. O'Connor, and Rev. Mr. Kelly (sec.) attended a reception given in his honor by the Sisters and young ladies of the Convent of Holy Cross.

At the conclusion His Lordship gave an eloquent address in which he dwelt on the excellence and refining influences of a convent training.

On Sunday morning His Lordship celebrated Low Mass at eight o'clock, and after High Mass, which was celebrated by Rev. Thos. Kelly, the procession was formed to the new church headed by his Lordship in full pontificals.

Presented to MOST REV. JAMES VINCENT CLEARLY, S. T. D., Lord Bishop of Kingston.

The ceremony of laying the corner-stone being concluded, the following address of welcome was read to His Lordship by Hon. D. McMillan, on behalf of the parishioners:

It is but a few days since your Lordship has been greeted by the clergy and laity of your diocese with congratulations upon your safe arrival at the Episcopal See from your visit to the Eternal City.

turn to the scene of your spiritual labors, after an absence of many months, with renewed strength and vigor.

It is gratifying to learn that although your absence had been prolonged beyond the time you expected, that has been productive of much good and that your most ardent wishes have been realized.

The occasion of your visit at this time is one of importance to the Catholics of this parish. It is now closing on three scores of years since the corner-stone of the church that stood upon the grounds now occupied by the new one was laid.

Since that time, though comparatively but a short period, many have been the changes and few, if any, of those present at that ceremony are alive, but the faith then possessed by the good people of that day who were the pioneers of Catholicity in the country, is as strong, as unchanged, as obediently observed by their descendants as it was in those days, for they have the religion transmitted from Him that established His Church upon the Rock, and which Church is to prevail against all adversities till the consummation of the world.

The progress made in the interest of religion materially as well as spiritually since we last had the pleasure of your Lordship's presence amongst us has been due to the energy and assiduity of the Rev. Father McDonnell, our worthy pastor, and we consider this a fitting opportunity to testify our warmest thanks and appreciation to him for his untiring zeal and labor in our behalf.

Permit me, my Lord, on behalf of this congregation, to assure you of our spiritual loyalty and devotion to the Holy Father and filial affection and obedience to his ministers, among whom Your Lordship is a brilliant star.

(Signed) D. McMillan, D. A. McDonnell, Angus B. Campbell, Angus McDonald, Archibald McPhee, Angus R. Macdonald.

On behalf of the congregation of St. Finnan's Church.

His Lordship, in reply, said that he had received with the greatest pleasure and delight the address which contained expressions of affection for which he was thankful.

He expressed thanks for the welcome given him, and said it was but an exchange of the affection he bore them. From the day on which he bore them, he felt a happiness inexpressible in being among them.

He then dwelt on the matter of preparing for the erection of their magnificent church, which would be an ornament, not only to the parish of St. Finnan, but also to the diocese of Kingston.

He then dwelt on the matter of preparing for the erection of their magnificent church, which would be an ornament, not only to the parish of St. Finnan, but also to the diocese of Kingston.

Wherefore, it was, that he went last year in response to the call of His Holiness. He had to give the Pope an account of his diocese and everything in it, of its churches and schools, and of the priests, and of the relations existing between the Catholics themselves and between them and the sects around them, and in telling the Sovereign Pontiff of his diocese he had to come down to Glenarry, the cradle of Catholicity in Ontario.

He then dwelt on the matter of preparing for the erection of their magnificent church, which would be an ornament, not only to the parish of St. Finnan, but also to the diocese of Kingston.

The customary collection was then taken up and aggregated the handsome sum of

nearly six hundred dollars, himself and Rev. Alex. McDonnell, the pastor of St. Finnan's, subscribing 850 each.—True Witness.

LETTER FROM BISHOP CLEARLY.

HE HAS GONE TO LAY THE CORNER-STONE OF A NEW CHURCH AT ALEXANDRIA—THE IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CATHEDRAL.

Kingston Daily News, July 14. The following letter, which explains itself, was read by the Rev. P. A. Twolney in St. Mary's Cathedral yesterday.

The Palace, Kingston, July 11, 1884.—My Dear Father Twolney: I regret being under the necessity of leaving home to-day for the purpose of laying the foundation stone of a new church in Alexandria next Sunday.

It would give me great pleasure to be with my people of Kingston and address them from the pulpit next Sunday on two most important subjects which engage my thoughts at present in their regard.

In the second place, I should like to set before the full congregation in distinct form the primary considerations which I submitted on Wednesday evening to the highly respectable and representative body of gentlemen who composed our meeting in the Brothers' School, with a view to our undertaking the glorious work of repairing and improving and bringing to completion our noble cathedral.

Certain repairs are absolutely necessary to insure the solidity and durability of the sacred edifice.

That certain alterations in the interior of the church are necessary for supplying fair and just accommodation to the large number of our people who, through want of sufficient space for pews, are compelled to remain standing throughout the long services, both morning and evening, on Sundays.

The exterior of the cathedral obviously demands that an effort should be made to finish it in accordance with the design of its original foundation. The truncated tower and turrets challenge the observation of all visitors to this city, and when it is mentioned that they have remained now forty years in this unfinished state, the question naturally suggests itself—

Why do they remain thus? The meeting on last Wednesday evening enthusiastically applauded my expression of belief, that the time had come for completing God's holy house and elevating this evening on Sundays.

I remain, dear Father Twolney, Yours very sincerely, JAMES VINCENT CLEARLY, Bishop of Kingston.

FESTIVITIES AT KNOWLTON.

RAISING FUNDS FOR THE CATHOLIC CHURCH—ADDRESSES BY MESSRS. LYNCH, TAILLON AND BLANCHET.

Monday was announced as the occasion of a grand bazaar and picnic to take place in aid of the Catholic Church of Knowlton, and but for the unfavorable state of the weather the day would have been a gala one for the French Canadians of the County of Bromo.

Shortly after 1 o'clock Hon. Mr. Lynch, Commissioner of Crown Lands, accompanied by Hon. Mr. Taillon, Attorney-General, Hon. Mr. Blanchet, Provincial Secretary, and Mr. Ouewen, M. P. P. for Argenteuil, who had been visiting some of the beautiful portions of this exceedingly beautiful section of country, arrived upon the ground, and met with a highly enthusiastic reception.

by Rev. A. F. Chevalier, H. Neill, G. G. Foster, Rev. A. P. Desrosiers, of Bedford, Rev. J. H. Charbonneau, of Bedford, Rev. A. St. Louis, of Waterloo, Rev. G. A. Plasse, of Yamaska, Rev. P. Grand, of St. Prosper, Rev. P. Cardin, of Yamaska, Rev. A. Moreau, of Three Rivers, Rev. Mr. Wurtelle, of the English church at Acton Vale, and many others.

Rev. Cure Petit ascended the platform and in a few well placed remarks thanked those present for their attendance and the interest they had shown in the work, expressing regret that the very unfavorable state of the weather had prevented many from attending who would otherwise have been present at the gathering.

Mr. Blanchet, and Mr. Fisher also made a few remarks expressive of the pleasure they felt in being present on such an occasion, and of the beauty of the county of Bromo and the harmony which existed in it.

The rest of the afternoon was occupied by the bazaar, which drew many persons, and a liberal amount was collected. During the afternoon music and singing were given at the hotel, and Hon. Mr. Taillon, whose social abilities are well known, favored those present with several of his choice songs, which, it is needless to add, were loudly encored.

TO THE JESUITS.

First Epistle of the New General of the Organization.

The first epistle of the new General of the Jesuits, who succeeded to the office upon the retirement of Father Beckx, has been issued to the order, and printed in accordance by the Episcopal printing office.

The highest law by which religious orders are ruled is this, that they obey the sovereign Pontiff, and are subject to his will and desire. The Vicar of Christ has the first place among all those who preside; he embraces all with his right and power, and every faculty as from a rich and inexhaustible source.

The first among them is the Sodality of the Blessed Virgin Mary. I think that we will carry out the desire of the Vicar of Christ if we endeavor carefully to found societies of young men and children under the name and protection of the Mother of God, and to attend to those which are already established. It seems almost providential that the three hundredth anniversary of the institution of the congregation of Prima Primaria—founded in Rome 300 years ago in the Church of Jesus—should be the same through which Leo XIII. teaches us how to fight against the pestiferous and secret societies of our age.

They prepare ruin for Christian States, while the Virgin Mother's help, which are all Christians has alone destroyed all heresies in the whole world. This event must stimulate our industry, and as this by lapse of time and rolling years generally declines, we must arouse our minds by reminding the ancient days in which the promise of our times declared, by its examples, how great is the strength and virtue of the sodalities of the Blessed Virgin Mary.

In our times great work must be done with the young men. Let us bring them together, teach them piety, defend them against errors and the temptations of vice. Hence, if we can in some way, according to the medical letter of the Pope, warn the pupils against the pernicious character of secret societies, we must do it, in order that the young may thoroughly learn how to avoid many deceitful arts by which their advocates are accustomed to ensnare men.

But in a case of so much importance we must not confine our work within the bounds of the societies. Whenever an opportunity arises, according as prudence suggests, we must take every chance, in churches, in colleges, in private conversation, even in epistolary intercourse, we must endeavor to arouse the ardor of men, and chiefly of those who are prominent in piety, learning, and intellectual power or authority. Great opportunities arise during the times of retreat and in the sermons or lectures given by priests or other pious people while minds are more ready to receive the light of truth, and more disposed to be put into practice what they have learned. Such occasion will not fail, as in many countries it is customary for men to attend retreats, and it is constantly admitted that in order to call back men to God it is necessary to use diligence and care.

There is no rival in the field. Extract of Wild Strawberry. It is the acknowledged champion for the cure of all Summer Complaints. Prejudiced People. Many people are prejudiced against patent medicines but all who try Burdock Blood Bitters are compelled to acknowledge it worthy a patent as a valuable discovery.

These are some of the opinions which we rightly call false and fallacious. We will know them better from the same pontifical letter; and to know them it is not enough to read it, but we must carefully consider it, in order to retain it fully in our minds. We learn from that letter what danger we are threatened with, not only by the wickedness of the opinions, but also by their connection and alliance.

It is, therefore, our duty to strive to oppose true principles to false opinions, and to had associations, assemblies of good morals and piety, faithful and devoted to the Church, having one mind and communion of principles.

I have very little to say about principles. We must draw them out of revelation and from that philosophy which, for the good of the Church and of our society, Leo XIII. has proposed to us, and which we see with great joy growing daily and brings forth those beautiful fruits which are the results of obedience to the Holy See.

We shall then strive by every effort to have ready at hand those principles which are fit to establish Catholic truths and to destroy the errors of materialists in order to destroy the errors which form the defence of secret societies.

To this teachers of young men, publishers of books and preachers of the Gospel will pay special attention. We must not only mind cultivated people, but the ignorant, too, and it will be a good idea to spread many examples of the Pontifical letters in little books, with explanations, from which Catholics may know what is to be avoided, what must be done and what must be believed and firmly held by them.

It remains now that we perform our duty with sincere humility, and deeming ourselves unworthy to serve such a holy cause, which certainly exceeds human power, and therefore it is necessary to ask strength from on high, and to rely on the help of God. Let us ask no reward for ourselves but labor; no glory but that which is obtained for God; no welfare but that which is bestowed upon the souls redeemed by the blood of the Son of God. Let the rule of life of our forefathers be our device: To God, glory; to the neighbor, welfare; to us, work!

The Holy Father has condescended to grant his blessing to our whole society. Congratulating you and myself for such a pledge received of divine assistance, I commend myself to the prayers of the society.

FISOLE, June 8, the feast of the Most Holy Trinity, the servant of you all in Christ. ANTONIUS MARIA ANDERLEDDY, S. J.

OUR BOOK TABLE.

Characteristics from the writings of St. H. Newman, by W. J. Lilly, of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-law, New York, D. J. Sadler & Co., 41 Barclay street, Montreal, 25 Notre Dame Street, Quebec.

This work has long been before the public and has met with such decided success that the Messrs. Sadler have wisely judged it proper to issue another edition of it in neat and compact form. It contains choice selections, personal, historical, philosophical and religious, from the works of Cardinal Newman, and is a veritable repository of his opinions on the most important subjects. We commend the present edition to our readers.

The Scapular Guide, a manual for the members of the Third Order of St. Francis. According to the recent decisions of the Holy See, by a Franciscan Father, (Gust. S. Joan. Bapt.) With the approbation of the Most Rev. Archbishop of Cincinnati, and of the Right Rev. Bishop of Covington. Cloth, 64c; Roman, red edges, 75c. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, and St. Louis.

This excellent little work has been prepared to give an Explanation of the Order, the Constitution and New Rule as published by His Holiness, Explanatory Comments on the Rule, Scapular Councils, Scapular Examples from the Lives of the beatified and canonized Saints of the Order, the new Ceremonial according to the official recommendation, the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin, and the usual Devotions. The manual is as its compiler intended it should be, a true guide to the Scapular, and cannot fail to popularize devotion to him.

Luther's Own Statements concerning his teaching and its results. Taken exclusively from the earliest and best editions of his German and Latin works. By Henry O'Connor, S. J. 12mo, paper, 50c.

This is a work deserving the very widest possible circulation. Of its accuracy and trustworthiness some idea may be formed from the following facts: 1. Not a single quotation from beginning to end is second-hand. 2. Each individual passage quoted has been seen with the Author's own eyes in the work referred to. 3. There is not a single quotation from the Table Talk, which, though published in the more recent editions of Luther's Works, was not written by Luther himself. 4. Not one quotation is taken from a Catholic author. Even the editions of Luther's works referred to were published by Luther's Protestant friends and admirers.

5. In every single instance the translation is by the Author, who recently spent seventeen years in the almost exclusive study of German. The translation itself is both literal and accurate. 6. Exact foot-note references are given for every passage quoted. 7. The references to the Wittenberg editions are interesting from a scientific point of view, inasmuch as they are reliable and faithful copies of the original titles. 8. The proof-sheets have been corrected till the Author was unable to find any inaccuracy either in the translation, in the quotations, or in the references. The work is divided into two parts, the first containing five and the second two chapters, as follows: PART I.—LUTHER AND HIS TEACHING. Luther rejects the Authority of the Pope. Luther admits the Authority of the Devil. Luther proclaims his own Authority and Infallibility. Luther acts with Authority and Infallibility. Luther's Intolerance against those who refuse to submit to his Authority and Infallibility. PART II.—RESULTS OF LUTHER'S TEACHING. Moral Results. No Rival in the Field.

There is no rival for Dr. Fowler's Extract of Wild Strawberry. It is the acknowledged champion for the cure of all Summer Complaints. Prejudiced People. Many people are prejudiced against patent medicines but all who try Burdock Blood Bitters are compelled to acknowledge it worthy a patent as a valuable discovery.

These are some of the opinions which we rightly call false and fallacious. We will know them better from the same pontifical letter; and to know them it is not enough to read it, but we must carefully consider it, in order to retain it fully in our minds. We learn from that letter what danger we are threatened with, not only by the wickedness of the opinions, but also by their connection and alliance.

The Catholic Record
 Published Weekly at 46 Richmond Street,
 London, Ontario.
 Rev. JOHN F. COFFEY, Editor.
 THOS. COFFEY, Publisher & Proprietor.
 Ottawa Agency:
 P. J. COFFEY, General Agent, 24 George St.
 RATES PER ANNUM—One Copy, \$2.00;
 three Copies, \$5.25; Five Copies, \$7.50; Ten
 Copies, \$12.50 Payable in every case in
 advance.
 Advertising rates made known on applica-
 tion.
 Approved by the Bishop of London, and
 recommended by the Bishops of Ottawa,
 Kingston, and Peterborough, and the Catho-
 lic Clergyman throughout the Dominion.
 All correspondence addressed to the Pub-
 lisher will receive prompt attention.
 Advertisers must be paid in full before the
 paper can be stopped.
 Persons writing for a change of address
 should invariably send us the name of their
 former post office.

Catholic Record.
 LONDON, SATURDAY, JULY 26, 1884.

OFFICIAL.

We are authorized to announce the following ecclesiastical appointments in the diocese of London:

Rev. Father Molphy, late pastor of Maidstone, to be pastor of Ingersoll.

Rev. Father O'Connor, P.P., Wawanosh, to replace Father Molphy in the pastorate of Maidstone.

Rev. Father West, late pastor of Raleigh and Ridgeway, to succeed Father O'Connor as pastor of Wawanosh.

Rev. Father Hodgkinson, late of Maidstone, to be pastor of Raleigh and Ridgeway.

THE JESUITS.

On Thursday last our city contemporary, the Advertiser, published a series of interviews with the clergymen of the various Protestant denominations of this city on the subject of the Salvation Army.

Among the interviewed was the Rev. Canon Innes, rector of St. Paul's Anglican Cathedral of this city. The rev. gentleman, in reply to the courteous representative of the Advertiser, favored him with a written document of great length, lofty pretensions, and, we were sorry to say, little erudition, though intense narrowness. The Canon, who was interviewed concerning the Salvation Army, devoted much of the space taken by him in the Advertiser to air his views on the Jesuits. He says:

"The rules which the Word of God lays down for the conduct of Christians are so clear and definite that nothing but ignorance could misinterpret them. Romans, 13; Matt. 26:52; the whole of the First Epistle of Peter (especially the second chapter). These were written concerning laws passed by heathen magistrates, and laws which were a burden upon Christian people in a professedly Christian land. But my chief cause of regret is because these people are under obligation to act as the mere tools of others, who are in no way affected by any punishment that may fall upon them. In other words, they are not what every Christian man and woman ought to be, independent actors and thinkers. They are parts of a mere machine, governed by the rules that have been laid down by an unscrupulous, self-constituted commander; rules that are most evidently compiled from two books, neither of which will commend themselves to men of independent thought or Christian principles, namely the rules of Ignatius Loyola for the government of the Jesuits, and those of Joseph Smith for the government of the Mormons; the principles of these works underlie the whole of 'General Booth's guide book for the discipline of the Salvation Army. I should justly be condemned for making such an assertion as this had I not the most indisputable testimony of the work in question now before me on my table.

God in mercy deliver us from a religion that feeds its followers upon noise, confusion and excitement; that would, if it could, close all the churches where there is order and decency of worship; that instils into its people the Jesuitical principles illustrated in the above quotations; that takes away from them the highest glory of manhood—the right to think, judge and act for themselves; and that boldly and unblushingly so limits the reading of its instructors as to preclude the possibility of their teaching being anything but the babbling of ignorance. Mr. Editor, I was at first strongly disposed to find this movement. I have carefully studied it, and, now unhesitatingly I condemn it. Let me conclude by giving a copy of the following letter, published with the consent of the writer. The Earl of Shaftesbury is well known all the world over as a godly, earnest, devoted and whole-hearted Christian man, whose life has been given to the promotion of the spiritual welfare of his fellowmen. Writing upon the character of this movement called 'the Salvation Army,' he says: 'It seems to me the work of the devil, who, having long tried to make Christianity odious, has changed his hand, and endeavors to make it ridiculous. The great and only strength of the party lies in their attack upon beer, tips and gin palaces; and, like true Jesuits, they justify the means by the end. Even when assuming for argument's sake there is a species of good produced, it is at the sacrifice of all reverence for religious things. Worship has become grotesque and gymnastic. All these unprecedented manifestations of the wildest actions, the wildest thoughts, and the most stultic purposes, indicate that some mighty changes are at hand. God in His mercy grant it may be the 'second advent' of our blessed Lord. Yours truly, SHAFESBURY."

The publication of statements so inaccurate, may, so utterly baseless, excited no little attention. It was on all sides asked why Canon Innes should, in a manner so offensive and under circumstances so unjustifiable, attack a body of

men eminent for learning, sanctity and zeal. It was asked why a gentleman professing to be a Christian minister should, without any provocation whatsoever, take occasion to offend a large body of his neighbors and fellow-citizens. And it was generally felt that such a course of action was calculated to disturb the harmony and extinguish the good-will happily subsisting between all classes of the citizens of London and that it called for a rejoinder. As a result of these convictions and feelings, the following letters appeared in the columns of our city contemporary:

To THE EDITOR:—In your issue of this day I find that the Rev. Canon Innes is reported in his statement of views on the Salvation Army as saying that "their rules are most evidently compiled from two books, neither of which will commend themselves to men of independent thought or Christian principle, namely, the rules of Ignatius Loyola for the government of the Jesuits, and those of Joseph Smith for the government of the Mormons." Now, sir, since the worthy Canon proclaims that he has made a careful study of this matter, I beg as one of your readers to ask whether it was of the Salvation Army, or of the Jesuits, or of the Mormons, or of all three, that you are so confidently and so positively informed that the Canon? This gentleman I know not, but judging from the malevolence of his ill-connected, though pompous production in your issue of today, I would say that, Canon though he be, he might learn Christianity from even General Booth or Joseph Smith. He will not find anywhere, even in their rules, that which he clearly practices, viz., injustice to his neighbor. Injustice to his neighbor did I say? Yes, sir, this Christian minister, this dignitary of a church professing peace and charity to all men, tells us, in your issue of today, that no man of independent thought or Christian principle can approve the rules of Ignatius Loyola. He makes the assertion, but advances no proof. I ask him, sir, as one of your readers, to give us his proof, and I will be prepared to meet him in a fair discussion of the subject. I may tell him, that in my estimation the rules of Ignatius Loyola have produced Christians of whose heroism he knows nothing—men whose hearts were never set on rich preferments or fat salaries. As far as Joseph Smith and the Mormons are concerned, I beg to say that the worthy Canon might well have left him and them alone. Does or does not Canon Innes believe in the right of private judgment? If he does, then what fault can he find with Joseph Smith for exercising that right? Does not the church of which Canon Innes is a dignitary permit divorce with the right of remarriage? Then what, my good Canon, is divorce as thus understood, but successive polygamy, while Mormonism is simultaneous polygamy? And are the deleterious effects of the latter greater than those of the former? These are a few questions which, in his leisure, the worthy gentleman might, sir, discuss with some profit to himself and with interest to the public. But when he again appears in print, let him disrobe himself of prejudice and seek to put on the armor of truth, however ill-fitting he may find it. London, July 17. INQUIRER.

To THE EDITOR:—In your issue of Saturday last I read the following paragraph:

"For some time past we have given the public the use of our columns to discuss the Salvation Army, and we have printed the letters pro and con impartially. This impartial attitude we intend to maintain, though we cannot help feeling that a good many of our correspondents manage to steer clear of the real point at issue. Hereafter we must request correspondents to attend to the substance of their names to their letters on this particular subject. There may be some point in the controversy not yet touched upon, but we doubt it. The city clergy have not hesitated to allow their names to be used in the expression of their views. There is no reason why anyone else should object to doing so."

I quite concur in the justice of your claim to impartiality in regard of the discussion on the Salvation Army. You have, indeed, extended to all your correspondents the widest latitude compatible with prudence of discussion and the dignity of journalism. The reading of the above cited paragraph, however, reminded me that I, sir, have been a trespasser upon your kindness in procuring the insertion of a non-de plume of my letter in reply to Canon Innes' statements in regard to the Jesuits. To remove all misconception as to the authorship of the letter signed "Inquirer," which appeared in your issue of Friday last, I beg to state that I assume responsibility for its preparation and publication. That letter was written in protest against unfounded and unwarrantable charges against an illustrious body of men—men whose exalted services in the cause of civilization are acknowledged by the unprejudiced and enlightened amongst non-Catholics. It was written, sir, in protest against the course taken by Canon Innes in going out of his way to offend the Catholic body, and in condemnation of an uncalculated attempt to disturb the harmony happily subsisting amongst the citizens of London of all classes and creeds. Of that letter I have not one word to withdraw. I may, however, be permitted to add to its statements that judging from his production of Thursday last, ordinance of heavier calibre than Canon Innes' will be required to demolish the Society of Jesus.

I am, sir, very respectfully yours,
 JOHN F. COFFEY, Priest,
 London, July 21.

—We direct attention to the letter of Father Anderley, General of the Jesuits, which appears in another column. It will convey to our readers an exact idea of the real purposes and scope of the Society of Jesus. It is, in fact, a complete answer to the calumnies uttered by the malevolent and the ignorant against the sons of Ignatius of Loyola.

THAT SENATORSHIP.

There is at this moment a vacancy in the Senate, created by the death of the late Senator Skead, of Ottawa. The number of aspirants for the position is, of course, large, but the friends of two of the candidates are particularly busy in urging their respective claims. These two candidates are Dr. Grant, at one time M. P. for Russell, and Mr. F. Clemow, Orange County Master of Carleton. Believing that the former gentleman has no chance whatever of appointment, we desire again to refer to Mr. Clemow's claims to fill the seat vacated by the death of the Hon. James Skead. We will take for text the following paragraph which appeared in the Ottawa Free Press of the 12th inst.:

"That much of the animosity existing between the Orange and Green elements of Canadian political life, as assumed for the purposes of the politicians, is illustrated by the fact that a prominent Catholic in this city who is a Romanist, is hawking around a petition, asking in the name of the undersigned Roman Catholics that an Orangeman be made Senator. The gentleman in charge of the petition, however, has not undertaken a pure labor of love. Those who are behind the scenes know that he, as the Catholic, and the person named in the petition as an Orangeman, have struck up a partnership. They have divided two important positions between them without even asking the Premier's 'By your leave.' The Orangeman, in return for assistance granted, in obtaining him the Senatorship, will aid in getting for the Catholic the Postmastership. Two Catholics, however, have refused to sign the petition in favor of making the Orangeman a senator, as they decline to be party to the transaction. Private conferences between members of the government and the two candidates are going on; and wires are being pulled more vigorously than ever so that the prizes may speedily fall. As a Liberal organ, under a system of 'to the victors belong the spoils,' it is useless suggesting the proper appointments to be made; but, nevertheless, we cannot refrain from being amused at the Catholic and duplicity being practiced to force the Premier's hand."

We are not, we must confess, surprised at the intelligence conveyed by our contemporary that there is a Catholic in Ottawa hawking around a petition asking, in the name of those Catholics who may sign it, the appointment of an Orangeman (Mr. Clemow) to the Senate. We are not at all surprised by this statement, for we know that there are individuals at Ottawa, as at every seat of government, ready to traffic in anything, no matter how sacred, to gain their own small ends. We know of several so-called Catholics in Ottawa who have trafficked in their profession of Catholicity; in its practice they had little to do with the religion, but they had much to do with the money. A prominent Catholic is, to our mind, a gentleman of mark in the social, political or business life of the nation, who distinguishes himself by a strict adherence to the rules of the church and by a generous support of its good works. But loud-mouthed professions do not make a prominent Catholic, nor mere wealth, nor brazen ignorance, nor relentless self-seeking. Any man claiming to be a Catholic who would sign such a requisition as that spoken of by the Free Press, either is ignorant of Mr. Clemow's career, in which case he is to be adjudged a very fool for commending a man he knows not, or is acquainted with that career, in which case he is to be considered devoid of every sense of shame and self-respect. We know not the names of any of the subscribers to this document of humiliation, but whoever its subscribers and promoters may be, we fearlessly tell them that as Catholics they can command neither influence nor respect by the course they pursue in this regard. We may remain Mr. Clemow's Catholic friends, the candidate for the postmastership included, but the whole of a province. If by an impossibility Mr. Clemow were recommended by the half, or even whole, of the Catholics of Ottawa, we should still condemn his appointment to the Senate of Canada. Too often have appointments been made to that body which neither regard for the public interests, nor respect for the dignity of Parliament, could justify. The Senate now requires all the strength that the highest qualifications in its individual members can confer. Its very existence, not to speak of its usefulness as a legislative body, depends very largely on the character of the selections made to fill up vacancies from time to time arising in its ranks. If men offensive to large and respectable classes of the people be selected the Senate is irreparably injured and its usefulness gravely impaired. We repeat in the strongest terms our statement that Mr. Clemow's appointment would be an outrage on decency and an unequalled insult to the Catholics of the Province. We desire the Premier to understand that no number of names secured by cajolery and fraud can make Mr. Clemow acceptable to the Catholic body. He has too often transgressed all rules of decency in his public utterances in regard of the Church and of its most cherished practices and highest articles of belief. That which all men should respect he has openly contemned, the conscientious rights of his fellow-men. Has he not time and again

used language of hatred and menace in regard of his Catholic fellow-citizens, for whom it is now proposed that he should sit as a legislator? Has he not been the leader of the most insulting demonstrations of Orange and Young Britain savagery that have ever disgraced the capital? Has he not, in language of fierce emphasis, proclaimed himself the deadly foe of the religion of nearly one-half the people of Canada? Could Catholics then expect justice at his hands in the legislation of the country. It was the vote of the late Senator Skead which secured Catholic Schools for the North-West. What if Mr. Clemow had then been in the Upper Chamber? Sir John A. Macdonald owes it to his sense of public duty to refuse to make any such appointment as that of Mr. Francis Clemow to the Senate of Canada. The French Canadian minority of Ontario is entitled to the senatorship made vacant by Mr. Skead's demise. The Premier, if not through some other motive, at least through a sense of gratitude to the French Canadians of Ontario, who have enabled his party to win and hold so many constituencies in this Province, should now honor some one of the many French gentlemen in Ontario fitted for the position with a call to the Senate. From amongst the French minority of the Province he can easily make a selection acceptable to the general public and of benefit to the legislature. The interests of a great and growing portion of the community are in this matter at stake, interests that the government of Canada cannot afford to disregard by refusing to them a voice in the Senate.

A VOICE FROM THE EAST.

"The London Catholic Record says we did it an injustice in our comments, a few weeks ago. We would make amends if we knew in what the injustice consisted. It also says that we showed misapprehension of the question at issue, by insisting that for Catholics the Bible is a rule of faith and morals."

If the Aurora had read our article on the Bible in schools with any great care it must have perceived that we spoke of the Protestant version of the Bible, which is not a rule of faith and morals for Catholics. In fact, no version of the Bible, when not approved and interpreted by the church, can be termed a rule of faith and morals even in the most restricted sense. The church is the Catholic rule of faith and morals. The Aurora showed a total misapprehension of the question at issue in various ways, notably in speaking of a Bible history for the use of our schools, when no one in this Province ever heard mention of any such proposal. The question with us is just this, whether or not the reading of the Protestant version of the Bible is to be made obligatory in the public schools. We hope our friend now at last understands the issue.

THE BIBLE IN SCHOOLS.

We publish with pleasure a letter from the Bishop of Erie, on the subject of bible reading in schools. This letter, addressed to a respected Catholic contemporary, fully endorses our position on this important subject. Here is the letter:

ERIE, June 30, 1884.

Editor *Lola Shore Visitor*.

DEAR SIR:—Within the last two or three months I have been asked repeatedly: In schools where the Protestant Bible is read, Protestant prayers are recited, and Protestant hymns sung, can Catholics allow their children to take part in, or be present at these exercises? Can Catholic teachers employed in such schools, conduct, be present at, or take part in such exercises? These questions I answered then and (as the matter concerns all) do so now by a decided negative. Such custom, wherever it prevails, is inconsistent with the faith which a Catholic professes, and without which he cannot be saved. Besides, in my opinion, were the question tested, it would be decided by the State Superintendent, and the Courts, that such custom is unconstitutional, if not (as it must appear to any impartial citizen) a plain violation of the rights of conscience.

T. McLELLAN,
 Bishop of Erie.

When our article on this subject appeared, we were told by one of our Catholic exchanges that our line of argument would lead to the belief that Catholics were afraid of the Bible. There was not a single line in our whole production on the subject that could lead to such a belief. We held, as we hold now, that to force Catholic children attending the public schools in this Province to read a Protestant version of Scripture were to invade their conscientious rights, and that as bible reading is an act of Protestant worship, Catholics cannot therein participate. We further held that the bible is for Protestants their rule of faith and practice, while for Catholics it is the Church alone that is such rule and guide. In Church teaching the Scriptures have indeed their place, but Scripture, without note or comment, can never be accepted as a source of Catholic instruction.

—We are unavoidably compelled to hold over till next week the addresses presented several of the priests of the diocese of London on the occasion of their removal to new fields of labor.

THE SALVATION ARMY.

The London Advertiser has, as elsewhere stated, taken measures to collect the various opinions of the city ministers of various Protestant churches on the subject of the Salvation Army. These opinions are, as may well be supposed, very diverse in character and purport. We do not propose to inflict on our readers a detailed statement of these views. We have, however, for their interest, not to say entertainment, made a selection of some of these ministerial expressions of opinion. For the benefit of those not resident in London, we may premise by stating that the Salvation Army had, in the eyes of a large number of our fellow-citizens, become a veritable nuisance by its daily demonstrations in the shape of processions, with flags flying and drums beating. Persons especially living in the neighborhood of the "barracks" were very seriously inconvenienced by the noises made by the Army. Public opinion grew more and more decided on the subject, till at length the City Council passed a bylaw prohibiting the beating of drums, singing of hymns, and such like displays on the public streets. No one living outside of London can form an idea of the extent of the objection on the principal thoroughfares caused by the processions of the Salvation Army. Large crowds collected at the various street corners to see the soldiers pass, doorways and the entrances to shops and offices were blockaded; besides, life and property were, from time to time, exposed to danger and loss by the sudden fright caused to horses by the drums and cymbals and fife, and the glare of the huge red flags wherewith men were invited to salvation. The passing of the bylaw gave satisfaction to a large body of citizens, but a large number sympathized with the army—especially when some of the soldiers, male and female, had been for its infraction consigned to prison. A mass meeting was held and resolutions adopted condemnatory of the action of the City Council in passing the bylaw and a deputation appointed to wait on the council to request its repeal. Meantime the army persisted in its displays and actually set the bylaw at defiance. The deputation which waited on the City Council presented a proposition from the Army, which was read by Mr. E. T. Essery. Its main points were:

1. That we will not beat drums or cymbals while passing any house where there is sickness.
2. That we will not annoy or disturb the members of any church or Sunday school by beating our drums, etc., while passing said churches or schools.
3. That we will not beat drums or cymbals or make any unnecessary noise within the barracks.
4. That we will not parade Dundas or Richmond streets on Saturday nights.
5. That we will exercise extra precaution against accidents, by appointing officers whose duty it shall be to look out for restive horses, Sunday schools, churches, etc., etc.

Other speakers followed Mr. Essery to urge the repeal of the by-law, but the council, by a vote of 6 to 4, refused to take this step. Since that time the discussion of the subject has proceeded in the press. The Advertiser, as before stated, conceived the idea of obtaining the views of the Protestant city clergy on the subject and gave its readers on Thursday, the 11th inst., a compendium of their opinions:

Rev. T. S. Johnston said:

"It is certainly not my way of doing the Lord's work. I have no sympathy with the mode of procedure adopted by the Salvation Army. Their movements have been injurious in a greater or lesser degree to my congregation by the beating of drums, not only during Sunday services and Sabbath school, but likewise on prayer-meeting nights. If they would confine the drum-beating and marching to week-days, however, I would not complain."

The Rev. L. W. Wickett thought otherwise. He said:

"I am glad I have an opportunity of contradicting the report that I am an enemy to the army. Such is not the case. I say, let them do their work as they think proper, provided they do not conflict with the rights of other congregations. While I may have my doubts as to the propriety of the methods they adopt, yet I will not say nay, as long as they do not disturb my congregation."

Rev. J. A. Murray pronounced himself strongly in favor of the civic by-law, and the Rev. R. W. Williams believed the Army capable of a great deal of mischief. He was of opinion that a Salvation Army in a city like London, or operating as they have been, is calculated to do a vast amount of injury to the young people. First, by disturbing the Sabbath schools, and drawing after them the young people of both sexes for the purpose of spending a pleasant Sabbath afternoon. Secondly, by inculting a want of reverence in the minds of the young by Sabbath school children continually listening to the Almighty being addressed in song, prayers, and frequently in exhortation in a serio-comic and flippant manner.

Rev. T. O'Connell was of the very decided opinion that the army was do-

ing more harm than good. The Salvationists should submit to the by-law because the bible said: "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's."

Rev. E. Middleton had sympathy for the boys and girls in jail, but he thought the by-law should be obeyed. Rev. Mr. Grant looked on the salvation parades, with their racket and display, as seriously interfering with the quiet and sacredness of the Sabbath. He was against Sunday parades of all kinds. Bishop Baldwin thought it was not consistent that a person should be drummed into becoming a Christian, or that it was necessary such playing and demonstration should be used at all in winning souls to Christ. The methods of the army were not endorsed by the Church of England, and he was assured that the church performed its spiritual work quite as well without having recourse to such excitable methods. He did not like to say anything against them at present, because he had not had an opportunity of observing the effect of their work, and knew little of his personal knowledge about the inward working of the movement and its results.

Rev. J. B. Richardson is evidently in hearty sympathy with the salvation people. He replied to the reporter in these terms:

"I have scrupulously refrained from any words of condemnation on the Salvation Army. Many of their methods and principles I could not approve of, but in the main their object seems to be good, and I believe they seek to exalt Christ and point sinners to him. Remembering the manifold and numerous influences around us for evil, every true servant of God must welcome any instrumentality, however imperfect, which God employs for the pulling down of the strongholds of Satan and the building up of His own blessed Kingdom among men."

He, however, advocated submission to the by-law.

Rev. E. B. Ryckman:

"The army have in two ways made themselves a nuisance. First, by disturbing the congregations of churches and Sunday schools in drum-beating past and near the buildings on Sundays, which was the means of drawing away many younger scholars from attending Sunday school. They had not disturbed the church or Sunday school of which he was pastor, but as chairman of the district, he had been consulted by pastors of other Methodist Churches in the city, who complained of the disturbance created by the army's playing. In the second place, their playing is a nuisance, because they have not respected the rights of others, but opposed their claims and openly defied the ordinances of the city."

These are, in brief, the views of many of the Protestant clergymen of this city on the subject of the salvation army. It will be seen that even underlying the professions of sympathy made by many for the army there is a feeling of bitterness against its methods and influence. The fact is, the army has in many quarters superseded the churches, and the ministers have to preach to empty benches. *Indiscreetly.* We have no sympathy whatever with the army, but must look on it as we would any other Protestant movement. It is the misfortune of Protestantism to be from time to time, as we shall show, afflicted with uprisings of the spirit of fanaticism that bring religion into ridicule and contempt, and lead to the gravest social disorders. The army, in our estimation, stands religiously on a principle quite as sound as that of any of the other heretical sects. The Salvation Army is the outcome of the exercise of the Protestant right of private judgment. The bible is with the army, like with all other Protestant sects, the rule of faith. In the Guide Book of the army we find the following:

"What authority has the Bible with the Army?"

"While we hold that God does, by His Spirit, speak as directly to His people in this age as in any other, still the Army does a lesson and most emphatically regard the Bible as the divinely authorized standard by which all other professed revelations are to be tried, and, if any professed revelations speak, and square not according to that standard, such revelations are to be rejected as having no truth in them. Whatever is contrary to the teaching of this book must be considered false and thrown overboard."

"To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them."—Isaiah viii. 20."

During the trial of the members of the Army for infraction of the city by-law the evidence given by the Salvationists prove that they, like all other Protestant bodies, look on the bible as their rule and guide. We find one, for instance, testifying:

"Tessie Hall—Am a member of the Salvation Army and hold the rank of Captain; have been a member for three years and stationed in various parts of the world; it is part of our worship to assemble on the market squares, and march through the streets, and this is done all over the world and permitted; I am responsible for the drum beating; I directed it and none of the others were responsible or consented to or authorized it: the singing and beating of drums is not a nuisance but a pleasure to me, and I do not think it can be a nuisance to any one else; the beating of drums and singing on the streets is part of our service and in doing so I think we are obeying the

Scripture: I am so done to defy the King street church the singing and beating and they came out and parades were carried out."

"Bartholomew C. of the Coffee House city, and a member Army; have been months probably through the world forms of worship, worship to assemble pray and sing; even we have done this doing this my deed and tell what God believe it is God was my sole motive morning; we had the market square join the Army unit that was nearly a we marched to the other defendants the beating of the drum or cymbals consult us; they solve the response and cymbals; King street was the singing was so inhabitants unless us."

We have not, declared, any system Army, its motto it is, we must say of Protestant pray have exercised the ants boast of exalt by private judgment to believe. They doctrines and which, to their commend themselves the Presbyterian doctrines may practices 'lu'icrous same standards of and practice of may be condemned. The leaders, general army, have just as the ministers condemn them. darkness, both from the salvation themselves apostles."

RETREAT AT

We announce retreat would Heart Convent and those from attending, to be on the 20th inst. conducted by S. J., Montreal hundred and six selves of the army retreat. Many Toronto, and delivered by the highly appreciated incultured with those privileges. The retreat of the 20th. In His Lordship tion of the Mo Convent chap ladies present they had enjoyed them to perse-

BISHOP CLE

We publish report of the sol stone of St. Fi which took place Lordship the at the cremation numerous clerical laity from the garry. Hon- behalf of the address breath of the most ge loyalty. His from the repu terms. The which will be completed, be case of King Ontario. We McDonnell of in the inaugu of religion, w ment of his and generosity.

THE B

The annu- ers of the which took a report will was the occa statement of tion. We that the Be one of the best manag- tions of the Henry Tay respects h difficult an in the themselves. The Presi- secured fo-

The Salva-
the by-law
Reader unto
Caesar's and
e God's."

I sympathy
jail, but he
be obeyed,
the salvation
and display,
a the quiet
of all kinds.
was not con-
be drummed
r that it was
d demonstra-
l in winning
thods of the
the Church of
red that the
ritual work
g recourse to
He did not
inst them at
not had an
the effect
little of his
t the inward
and its re-

idently in
salvation peo-
porter in these

frained from
on the Salva-
methods and
ove of, but in
is to be good,
exalt Christ
Remember-
merous influ-
e, every true
no any insur-
erfect, which
ing down of the
ne building up
ngdom among
submission to

ways made
First, by dis-
s of churches
n-beating past
undays, which
g away many
ng Sunday
disturbed the
of which he
an of the dis-
ring by pastors
es in the city,
the disturbance
aying. In the
is a nuisance,
respected the
ed their claims
inances of the

views of many
en of this city
army. It
nderlying the
made by many
eling of bitter-
and influence,
many quarters
and the min-
empty benches.
e no sympathy
but must look
ther Protestant
fortune of Pro-
e time, as we
apings of the
bring religion
pt, and lead to
rs. The army,
s religiously on
as that of any
ts. The Salva-
of the exercise
of private judg-
the army, like
sects, the rule
book of the army

the Bible with
od does, by His
to His people
other, still the
most emphatic
the divinely
which all other
re to be tried,
relations speak
g that stand-
to be rejected
em. Whatever
ng of this book
se and thrown

the testimony: if
to this word, it
ght in them."

members of the
the city by-law
the Salvationists
ll other Protes-
e bible as their
ind one, for in-

member of the
old the rank of
member for three
various parts of
our worship to
market squares,
the streets
am over the
am responsible
directed it and
e responsible or
ized it: the sing-
is not a nuis-
e, and I do not
nce to any one
uses and singing
our service and
e obeying the

Scripture; I am sure of this; it is not done to defy the authorities or any one; a few Sundays ago, as we came to the King street church, I gave orders for the singing and beating of drums to stop and they came out and told us to commence again. Another testified that the parades were carried out by command of God.

"Bartholomew Cottam—Am proprietor of the Coffee House, a ratepayer in the city, and a member of the Salvation Army; have been a member for twelve months probably; the Army is known through the world; they have particular forms of worship, and it is part of their worship to assemble on the market and pray and sing; ever since I have belonged we have done this without hindrance; in doing this my desire was to benefit others and tell what God has done for me; I believe it is God's command; and that was my sole motive; I was marching that morning; we had our usual exercises on the market square that morning; I didn't join the Army until the service was over, that was nearly a quarter to eleven, and we marched to the barracks; I and the other defendants had nothing to do with the beating of the drums or cymbals; we were not insulted at the beating of the drum or cymbals; the captain doesn't consult us; the officers took on themselves the responsibility of these drums and cymbals; I consider the singing on King street very nice; I don't think the singing was calculated to disturb the inhabitants unless they were biased against us."

We have not, as we have already declared, any sympathy with the Salvation Army, its methods, or its aims. But it is, we must say, the natural outcome of Protestant principles. Its members have exercised the right which all Protestants boast of exercising, that of deciding by private judgment that which they are to believe. They have embraced a set of doctrines and adopted a line of practice which, to their minds and consciences, commend themselves. To the Anglican, the Presbyterian, or the Methodist, these doctrines may appear absurd, and these practices ludicrous, but, according to the same standards of judgment, the doctrine and practice of any of these other sects may be condemned by the Salvationists. The leaders, general and captains of the army, have just as much mission to teach as the ministers of all sects so ready to condemn them. Both are groping in darkness, both outside the true fold, far from the salvation of which they proclaim themselves apostles.

RETREAT AT THE SACRED HEART.

We announced some weeks ago that a retreat would be held at the Sacred Heart Convent for the ladies of London and those from elsewhere desirous of attending, to begin on the 14th and close on the 20th inst. The exercises were conducted by the Rev. Father Kenny, S. J., Montreal. No fewer than one hundred and sixty ladies availed themselves of the opportunity of making the retreat. Many attended from Detroit, Toronto, and elsewhere. The instructions given by the Rev. Father Kenny were highly appreciated, and the lessons he inculcated will be long remembered by those privileged to assist at the retreat. The retreat closed, as we have said, on the 20th. In the afternoon of that day, His Lordship the Bishop, gave benediction at the Most Holy Sacrament in the Convent chapel, and addressed the ladies present on the singular privilege they had enjoyed, and earnestly exhorted them to perseverance.

BISHOP O'LEARY AT ALEXANDRIA.

We publish in another column a report of the solemn blessing of the cornerstone of St. Finnan's Church, Alexandria, which took place on the 6th of July. His Lordship the Bishop of Kingston presided at the ceremony, which was attended by a numerous clergy and a vast concourse of laity from all portions of Catholic Glinagarry. Hon. Senator MacMillan read, on behalf of the Catholics of Alexandria, an address breathing in every line sentiments of the most generous and devoted Catholic loyalty. His Lordship, as will be seen from the report, replied in most felicitous terms. The new church of Alexandria, which will be of solid stone, will, when completed, be one of the finest in the diocese of Kingston and in the Province of Ontario. We heartily congratulate Father McDonnell on the success he has met with in the inauguration of this splendid work of religion, which will long stand a monument of his zeal and of the devotedness and generosity of his faithful people.

THE BANK OF LONDON IN CANADA.

The annual meeting of the shareholders of the Bank of London in Canada, which took place last week, and of which a report will be found in another column, was the occasion of a very satisfactory statement of the affairs of this corporation. We have no hesitation in saying that the Bank of London in Canada is one of the most solid, because one of the best managed, of the monetary institutions of the country. Its President, Henry Taylor, Esq., is a gentleman in all respects highly qualified for the very difficult and responsible position he fills in the institution. The directors did themselves credit by re-electing him to the Presidency, and have thereby secured for the bank a continuance of

public favor and a renewed lease of general confidence. We congratulate the bank on its healthful state, and wish it increased prosperity during the coming year.

As a local institution the Bank of London in Canada is, we need not say, deserving of the heartiest support of the people of London and the adjoining country.

AN INQUITOUS SCHEME.

An interesting, suggestive and instructive page of history is that of the incorporation of the city of Ottawa. Previous to the first Monday of January, 1855, Ottawa was called Bytown. Founded about the year 1828, it was, till 1841, a place of comparatively small importance, but in that year it was made a Parliamentary borough and for the ten years between 1844 and 1854 its growth was very rapid. In the latter year its population was variously estimated at from ten to twelve thousand souls, the latter being most likely the correct figure. Nearly two-thirds of the population of the town of Bytown was at this time Catholic. But the Protestant minority was aggressive, determined, and united, resolved, at the first favorable opportunity, to acquire predominance in the municipal affairs of the place. Though no Catholic had as yet sat for Bytown in the legislature of the country, though the civic chair had been filled in turn by worthy Protestant gentlemen, the Orange faction felt aggrieved, restless and uneasy because the majority of the town council was Catholic, and that this rising burg gave promise of becoming a Catholic city.

In 1854 Mr. Henry James Friel, being Mayor, the town council of Bytown resolved to petition the legislature of Canada for the incorporation of the town as a city under the name and title of the city of Ottawa. The growing importance of the place as a trading point, and its rapidly increasing population, justified this step on the part of the corporation of Bytown. The Council had a bill prepared for the incorporation of the proposed city and its division into wards, in accordance with right and justice. Let us follow the bill through its progress in Parliament. On the 27th of Sept., 1854, Mr. W. F. Powell, member for Carleton, presented the petition of the town council of Bytown, which on the 29th of the same month was read, "praying for the passing of an act creating the said town a city, under the name of the City of Ottawa." The petition was, of course, referred to the committee on standing orders, from which, on the 3rd of October following Mr. Langton reported: "Your committee have examined the petition of the town council of Bytown, for an act to erect the said town into a city, under the name of the city of Ottawa, and find that sufficient notice was given so far as the incorporation of the said town is concerned, but the name of the proposed city is stated therein to be Queensborough, while in the petition the name is given as the city of Ottawa."

The journals of the Legislative Assembly for the same day contain the following item: "Ordered, that Mr. Powell have leave to bring in a bill to erect the town of Bytown into a city, under the name of the city of Ottawa. He accordingly presented the said bill to the House, and the same was received and read for the first time: and ordered to be read a second time on Tuesday next."

The bill was not till the 9th of November, read a second time, when it was referred to the Committee on Miscellaneous Private Bills, from which, on the 17th, a report was received, stating that the Committee had gone through the bill and made certain amendments thereto which they begged to submit for the consideration of the House.

The Journals for the 24th of November contain the following item: "The House, according to Order, resolved itself into a Committee on the Bill to erect the Town of Bytown into a City, under the name of the City of Ottawa; and after some time spent therein, Mr. Speaker resumed the Chair; and Mr. Mattice reported, That the Committee had gone through the Bill, and made an amendment thereunto."

Ordered, That the Report be now received. Mr. Mattice reported the Bill accordingly; and the amendment was read, and agreed to.

Ordered, That the Bill be read the third time to-morrow.

And the Question being again proposed, That the Bill be now read the third time. Mr. O'Farrell moved in amendment to the Question, seconded by Mr. Fournier, That the word "now" be left out, and the words "this day six months" added at the end thereof;

And the Question being put on the Amendment; the House divided:—And it passed in the Negative.

Then the main Question being put: Ordered, That the Bill be now read the third time.

The Bill was accordingly read the third time.

Resolved, That the Bill do pass.

Ordered, That Mr. Powell do carry the Bill to the Legislative Council, and desire their concurrence.

It is here pertinent to remark upon the base conspiracy which, from the moment the bill was introduced, had been at work to defeat the well under-

stood wishes of the majority of the electors and people of Ottawa. The division of the city into wards, as proposed by the town council, did not meet the views of the ultra-Protestant minority, nor those of the member for the town, Mr. Yeilding, who by a deplorable misunderstanding, had been returned at the general election of 1854 to represent Bytown in the Legislative Assembly of Canada, nor those of the member in charge of the bill, nor of others from the Ottawa district. Their desire and purpose it was, in so far as they could carry into effect that desire and purpose, to hand over to an intolerant minority of Ottawa the municipal government of the city. For this purpose the Catholic majority was most shamefully "hived" by the provisions of the amendment made to the clause of the bill dealing with the division of the city into wards. Nearly two-thirds of the population of the city was grouped together after the most approved method of gerrymandering and a wretched oligarchy placed for years in control of the city of Ottawa. No Catholic could be elected Mayor of Ottawa, nor could any Catholic hold office under the bigoted council. The worst days of the exclusiveness and bitterness of Irish Protestant corporations were revived in this new country, with the saddest results to the progress of the municipality.

But let us proceed with the history of the bill. On the 30th of November the bill was put through its final stages: The Journals record its passage in these terms: "The Order of the day for the third reading of the Bill to erect the Town of Bytown into a City, under the name of the City of Ottawa, being read."

Mr. Powell moved, seconded by Mr. Yeilding, and the Question being proposed, That the Bill be now read the third time: "The Honorable Mr. Robinson moved in amendment to the Question, seconded by Mr. Crawford, that all the words after 'the' to the end of the Question be left out, and the words, 'recommitted to a Committee of the whole House, for the purpose of amending the same, by leaving out the word 'Ottawa' and inserting the word 'Bytown' instead thereof, and leaving out that part of the Bill which gives power to change the name of 'Bytown' to 'Ottawa' inserted instead thereof."

And the Question being put on the Amendment, the House divided; and the names being called for, they were taken down. Yeas 10, Nays 49. Mr. O'Farrell deserves the gratitude of the people of Ottawa for his efforts to protect the minority from the conspiracy which had virtually compassed their disfranchisement. His efforts proved unavailing in the presence of a solid Ottawa delegation in favor of the bill as amended. The bill was brought to the Legislative Council as ordered by Mr. Powell, and passed through all its stages in that body with little or no difficulty, and was assented to on the 18th of December, 1854. Its second section provided for the division of the city into wards after the following manner: "The said city of Ottawa shall be and is hereby divided into five Wards, viz: That portion of the City lying easterly from the Rideau Canal shall constitute three Wards, and the portion of the City lying westerly from the Rideau Canal shall constitute two Wards, which latter two Wards shall be divided by the centre of Wellington street, George street, Victoria Terrace and the concession line known as the Richmond road, to the limits of the City; and the portion lying north of the said streets and road, shall constitute one Ward, to be called Victoria Ward; and the portion lying south of the said streets, shall constitute a Ward, to be called Wellington Ward; the portion of the City lying easterly from the Rideau Canal, as aforesaid, shall be divided and called as follows, viz: The whole of Rideau street and the portion north of the said streets and road, shall constitute one Ward, to be called St. George's Ward; that portion of the City from the line dividing Rideau and George streets and a continuation of such line, terminating on the Rideau Canal in one direction, and on the waters of the river Rideau in another, to the centre of St. Patrick street, and in a continuation line therefrom, east and west, to the waters of the rivers Ottawa and Rideau, shall constitute a second Ward, to be called By Ward, and the remaining portion lying north of the line above described, on St. Patrick street and the continuation thereof, shall constitute a third Ward, to be called Ottawa Ward."

To demonstrate the complete unfairness of this division we need but point out that the census of 1861 showed the population of the City of Ottawa, as divided into wards in accordance with the said Act of incorporation, to be as follows: Wellington Ward, 2,345; Victoria Ward, 2,039; St. George's Ward, 2,437; By Ward, 3,939; Ottawa Ward, 3,689; Hospital and other Institutions, 231; total, 14,699. In other terms, By and Ottawa Wards alone contained, in 1861, 7,619 inhabitants, more than one-half of the total population of the city, and had but the same representation in the City Council as Wellington and Victoria Wards, with a total population of 4,382 persons—no one-third of the total population of the whole city; the official figures likewise prove that while all that portion of the city lying east of the Rideau Canal had, by the census of 1861, a population of 10,056, or more than two-thirds of the total population of the city, it enjoyed but three-fifths of

the representation in the City Council. We need hardly say that the census of 1871 likewise established the existence of very great disproportion between the population and consequently the representation, in so far as population was concerned, of these Wards, the figures then given being: Wellington Ward, 4,039; Victoria Ward, 3,156; St. George's Ward, 3,474; By Ward, 5,138; Ottawa Ward 5,738; total, 21,545, which, by the census of 1881, it is shown that the three Wards east of the Rideau Canal have a total population of 16,058, and those west of the Canal 11,364, the former having nine and the latter six members in the City Council.

It is to be observed that the population of the western portion of the city has grown very rapidly, especially within the last ten or fifteen years. It is now nearly as great as was that of the whole city in 1861. It has so grown that Victoria Ward, where, in 1861, there were comparatively few Catholics, there is now a majority, with the prospects of its becoming in time more and more Catholic in voting power and population. And this is just what the clique of narrow bigots, who propose a second gerrymander of the city of Ottawa, with a view to the disfranchisement of the Catholic majority, greatly fear. They see that with the rapid growth of the Catholic body in numbers and influence, even in wards gerrymandered in 1854 into Protestant strongholds that to retain a majority in the city council a new struggle is necessary. The Ottawa Citizen gives us a clear insight into the workings of the faction, which, to gratify bigotry, would sacrifice the best interests of the Dominion metropolis. Said the Citizen of a recent date: "Many weeks ago it was stated in these columns that an active movement was on foot to redistribute the wards of the city, and that should it be successful Ottawa would have seven wards instead of five. The outlines of the wards, according to the proposed redistribution, were also given. By the addition of two new wards to the city, under the present system of three members to each ward, the Council would be increased from fifteen to twenty-one members. This by some was considered an objectionable feature, as it would render the Council a body cumbersome in numbers, and probably unnecessarily prolong their debates. It was suggested by others that this difficulty could be overcome by reducing the representatives of each ward to two, making the Council one less in number. It was generally understood that the two Lower Town, By, and Ottawa Wards, would not be affected, but that the two new wards would be constructed by a division of St. George's, Wellington and Victoria Wards. At a meeting of the Council, held on May 5th, a resolution was carried, moved by Ald. Cox, seconded by Ald. Erratt, affirming the expediency of a new division into wards of the city, and a committee consisting of Aids. Cunningham, Cox, Brown, Swallow, and Desjardins was appointed to prepare a scheme for that purpose, and to apply to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to ratify such scheme, and to authorize the Mayor and City Clerk to sign any such petition and to attach to it the seal of the Corporation. This resolution of the Council vested in the hands of the committee without appeal to its authority to decide on a re-division of the wards, and also to petition the Lieutenant-Governor to ratify their action. The committee met on Monday evening, when all members were present with the exception of Ald. Brown. The scheme decided upon was the same as that foreshadowed in the Citizen a considerable time ago. It is proposed that the two new wards shall be known as Rideau and Charlotte Wards. The latter will include the whole of Victoria Ward and that portion of Wellington Ward lying between Wellington and Sparks streets as far as Elgin street. The former will take in that portion of Wellington Ward west of the canal and that portion of St. George's Ward east of the canal to Nicholas street. The new Victoria Ward will be no portion of the former ward of that name, but a sub-division of a western portion of Wellington Ward. Wellington Ward will be but a sub-division of a part of old Wellington Ward. As stated before, the two Lower Town wards will not be interfered with."

Or, in plainer terms, since the Citizen does not say it, we will, this committee proposes to establish five new wards in the city of Ottawa, to secure for the 11,000 Protestants there a representation of fifteen members in the City Council, leaving the Catholic majority a representation of six. This is representation according to population with a vengeance. Representation according to population was an old time doctrine of Mr. C. R. Cunningham, whose crafty hand we discern in this disgraceful gerrymander. Mr. Cunningham used to protest a dislike of gerrymandering, but with him, after all, anything is acceptable when the end is the killing of Popery. Mr. Cunningham's name will, indeed, be a marked one in the annals of metropolitan bigotry. By adding a portion of Wellington to Victoria Ward the population of the latter could easily be increased to 5,500, and the former reduced to about the same figure. Thus would all inequality be removed—thus all reason for a wholly unequal-for augmentation of the City Council be obviated.

We hope that the citizens of Ottawa, irrespective of creed, will unite in a protest to the government against the iniquitous course proposed by the committee. Not only would injustice be inflicted by this division on the Catholic

majority of Ottawa, but the respectable Protestant minority of the Lower Town wards made to suffer the most grievous injustice. Their interests are in common, in this regard, with those of their Catholic fellow-citizens. The whole action of the council then appears to us illegal. We are of opinion that the mayor cannot, on behalf of the Council, sign the prayer of the Committee to the Lieutenant Governor, or that the seal of the corporation can be legally attached to a document which has not been revised or approved by the council. Such a delegation of powers to a committee was never contemplated by the Municipal Act. The law is, to our mind, clearly against this infamous gerrymander. The revised statutes of Ontario, Title XII, Division II, deals with the point at issue in these terms: "In case two-thirds of the members of the Council of a City or Town do, in Council, before the fifteenth day of July in any year, pass a resolution affirming the expediency of a new division into Wards being made of the City or Town, or of a part of the same, either within the existing limits or with the addition of any part of the localities adjacent, which, from the proximity of streets or buildings therein, or the probable future exigencies of the City or Town, it may seem desirable to add thereto respectively, or the desirability of any addition being made to the limits of the City or Town, the Lieutenant-Governor may, by proclamation, divide the City or Town or such part thereof into Wards, as may seem expedient, and may add to the City or Town any part of the adjacent Township or Townships which the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, on the grounds aforesaid, considers it desirable to attach thereto. 36 V. c. 48, s. 18.

But whether strictly legal or not, let the action of the committee be met by a stern, vigorous and united protest to the government of Ontario. We appeal to that administration to see that justice is in this regard done the Catholic majority, French and Irish, of Ottawa, in this all important matter. We ask that at least an appeal be made to the electorate of Ottawa before such a revolution be inaugurated in the municipal affairs of one of the leading cities of the Province. The action of the government on this question will be eagerly watched by the Catholics, not alone of Ottawa, but of the whole Province.

THE FRANCHISE BILL.

An Autumn session is now a certainty. Meantime the breach between the Lords and Commons is daily widening, and the bitterness between the contending parties becoming more and more intense. The Marquis of Salisbury is defiant, Mr. Gladstone determined. A cable despatch informs us that the liberal and independent papers are daily stiffening in tone. The Times, until now cautious, supports Mr. Gladstone on this question without reserve, stating that a second rejection of the Franchise Bill by the Lords would entail the most serious consequences, and reduce the whole business to a naked struggle for supremacy between the two Houses. It is said to predict openly what Ministers have been saying quietly, that Mr. Gladstone would ultimately, instead of dissolving the Commons, advise the Queen to create Peers in sufficient number to insure a Liberal majority. It also plumply pronounces an hereditary chamber intolerable on any principle accepted at the present day. It does seem that the Lords are at last to be dealt with as they should long since have been dealt with, either completely effaced or rendered powerless forever.

THE UNIVERSITY QUESTION.

In the Ottawa Citizen of the 21st inst., we read: "An article appears in the London Record, a church organ, in which, according to the Evangelical Churchman, the university situation in Ontario is grossly misrepresented."

And further on: "The Evangelical Churchman deserves credit for its courage in meeting the misrepresentations which, it is said, appear in the statement published in the Record." The Citizen then takes it for granted, on the word of the Evangelical Churchman, that we misrepresented the Provincial University. We beg to state that we did nothing of the kind. What we did was to insist on the concession to the Catholics of Ontario of the same rights in the matter of university education as those enjoyed by the supporters of the Public School system; whose opposition is the Provincial University. We may inform the Citizen that its purpose of defending the Provincial University will not deter us from persistence in defence of Catholic rights in this most important matter. We have no quarrel with the public schools or the university. We say that they do not meet the wants of Catholics, and under this conviction maintain that Catholic separate schools should be placed on a par in all regards with the public schools, and a Catholic university in Ontario placed, in the matter of state aid and recognition, on the fullest terms of equality with the Provincial University. Our contemporary may indeed consider this a bold, but it is

a just claim. The Citizen concludes with the statement: "The Public School cannot be attacked without the Provincial University sharing in the effects of the onslaught. We feel satisfied that the Government will have backbone enough to take a bold stand on this question, and to give the assailants of both the Public School system and the assailants of the Provincial University an answer so unequivocal that there will be no mistaking its meaning and its significance."

We hope, indeed, that the government will take a bold and firm stand on the question of university education, that it will see that justice is done all parties, and the Catholic minority placed on a footing of perfect equality with their fellow-citizens of other denominations.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

Articles on the feast of St. Anne and other subjects, besides a summary of Bishop Ireland's great lecture on Progress through religion, are unavoidably held over.

We are reluctantly compelled to hold over the report of the presentations made to Mr. J. P. Aylward, late Principal of the Separate Schools of Guelph, on the occasion of the severance of his connection with these schools.

We are happy to announce that the Rev. Father Tiernan continues to improve in health. We are also very much pleased to note that Dr. McInigan, for some time dangerously ill, is now rapidly approaching convalescence.

We deeply regret to chronicle the tidings that Judge Lacourse, of Berlin, by taking an overdose of gelaminum, a powerful drug, to cure neuralgia, almost died on Wednesday last. We hope that the learned judge will soon be fully recovered from the effects of this untoward accident.

We have very much pleasure in informing our readers of the clergy that there will, in the Record, be hereafter reserved due space for authenticated decisions on liturgical subjects. This column will, we doubt not, prove of great interest and usefulness to our many clerical readers.

Many persons here profess to be horrified at the insubordination of the Salvationists in refusing to obey the city by-law. But their insubordination is, as we will next week show, the natural outcome of Protestant rebellion against all authority, and quite insignificant beside the results brought about through the teachings of Luther and the early reformers.

The Ridgeway Plaindealer pays the following tribute to a deserving priest:—Rev. Father West, late of Raleigh and St. Michael's, Ridgeway, has been given charge of a parish at Ashfield, near Goderich. Very many Protestants as well as Catholics will regret his removal. He is an accomplished and genial gentleman as well as a devoted parish priest. It will be always gratifying to his old parishioners and to his many warm friends here to learn that he is prosperous and well and happy.

St. Peter's Cathedral in this city was on Sunday last filled to overflowing by a most attentive congregation, eager to hear the sermon of the Rev. Father Kenny, S. J., previously announced in the daily press. The rev. gentleman, having read the gospel of the Sunday, preached on the necessity of confining profession to practice. It was a masterly and scholarly effort. We may here remark that Father Kenny is a son of the late Hon. Sir Edward Kenny, who, from 1867 to 1870, held a seat in the Dominion cabinet, and for many years represented Nova Scotia in the Senate of Canada. Sir Edward was also for a time a lieutenant of Nova Scotia. It was Father Kenny who preached the sermon on the memorable occasion of the consecration of the late Archbishop Hannon, of Halifax, in 1877, the consecrator being His Excellency the Most Rev. Dr. Conroy, Apostolic Delegate to Canada.

We have received from the Rev. Dr. Spetz, of St. Jerome's College, Berlin, a copy of the splendid lithograph portrait of Bishop Carbery, of Hamilton, presented to His Lordship by the Alumni Union of St. Jerome's College, on the 1st of July last. We have received likewise, with hearty thanks, a very beautiful and lifelike lithograph portrait of Rev. Dr. Louis Funcken, C. R., Berlin, Ont., which has just been executed by the renowned artists, Kurz and Allison, of Chicago, Ill. These portraits are ready for distribution on the following conditions: 1. Former students and friends of the College who contribute books, or any amount in cash, or both, to the Library of St. Jerome's College, will receive the portrait gratis as a memento; 2. Others can procure it from Rev. Theo. Spetz, D. D., at the following rates: 1st size, 14x22 inches, 50 cents; 2nd size, 22x28 inches, 75 cts. A copy mailed free to any address upon receipt of price. All orders should be addressed to Rev. Theo. Spetz, D. D., C. R.

On the 1st of May, at Rome, Mrs. Templeton Strong was received into the Church at St. Alphonsus de Liguori on the Equiline. Cardinal Hohenlohe received the aljuration of Mrs. Strong, and administered to the new convert the Sacraments of Confirmation and the Holy Eucharist. Mrs. Templeton Strong was assisted by the Countess Hightstrom, who represented the Princess Wittgenstein, and Mrs. Astor Bristol and Madame Reggio. Amongst those present at the ceremony was Father Douglas, of the Redemptorists.

