





FROM THE IRISH BENCHES.

United Ireland. House of Commons, Wednesday. This has been unquestionably the most eventful week of the session. On Monday the Government introduced a sweeping Bill which proposes to revolutionize the basis of rural society—to sweep away grand juries, to create elective county boards, and generally to throw the management of all local affairs into the hands of elected representatives of the people. To-day they throw out a Bill to provide a temporary measure of relief for unfortunate Irish tenants who are threatened with eviction on account of unjust arrears.

On Monday night the preliminary resolution to provide King Harman with a salary passed through committee. It has been a week laden with significance, big with issues whose influence stretches far into the future. I have cited, unjust and cruel though two of them are to the Irish people, form a combination whose force as an element of Home Rule propaganda cannot be overestimated. They will bring home to the door of every voter in England the difference between English Government for Ireland. Here is the Tory Government with one hand giving to the English masses a tremendous boon of self-government, with the other holding back from the Irish tenant protection against unjust exaction and downright robbery for England. Even Tory Government has their time making "the bonds of freedom broader yet," for Ireland they pass perpetual Coercion Acts and devices for making evictions cheap and easy and resolutions to make the most notorious rack-renter in the country head engineer of the tyranny. Such is the reasoning of the Parliamentary events of this week, it must strike every clear-headed Englishman.

But there is another lesson, and a more pleasant one, which we may draw from these events, from the introduction of the Local Government Bill at any rate. In this sweeping radical, revolutionary measure—we have a gauge of the extent to which the depths of English politics have been stirred by the present agitation on the Irish question in this Bill conferring self-government on local affairs upon a people already possessing national self-government. We see the radical action of the Government for Ireland. Had Home Rule not become pressing such a Bill as this would not have appeared in Parliament for years yet. It is the pressure of Home Rule which has squeezed this forward. How imminent and powerful that pressure must be to have driven a Tory Government to propose the abolition of the Tory searchers. If it were nothing more than an indication of the enormous influence of the Irish Home Rule question upon English politics, this Local Government Bill would be a splendidly encouraging symptom. But it is something more. It is the precursor of Home Rule which the Government can never get back from this Bill a similar measure to which they promised at the beginning of their term of office to introduce simultaneously for Ireland. They must go forward from it or clear out of the way, and let other men face the duty. So much for the extraordinary measure of which Mr. Balfour sketched the outline for the House on Monday. For immediate import to the Irish people, however, for its effect upon the Government, and even for sensational interest, to-day's debate throws Mr. Ritchie's Bill in the shade.

Mr. Parnell moved the second reading of his arrears Bill on September twelve months. When Mr. Parnell moved the second reading of another Bill, and the Government threw it out, it was an occasion from which dated a new crisis in the Irish land question. From to-day another new crisis will be dated. The rejection of Mr. Parnell's Bill of 1885 created the Plan of Campaign, was made the pretext for a perpetual Coercion Bill, and for a Government Land Bill, which was simply a portion of Mr. Parnell's Bill that Mr. Balfour fathered and brought in himself at half-past the eleventh hour. What will follow the rejection of Mr. Parnell's Bill of 1886, which was nothing more than the Bill of 1885 which the Government had left unappropriated by his Bill of 1886, it is not for me to predict. To-day's doings, at any rate, were as decisive and momentous, if not even more so, than those of 1886.

The Government and their Liberal-Unionist ramp have taken up an untenable and unjustifiable position, from which they must retreat without delay, or else bear the responsibility for all the grievous trouble that must ensue from their action before very long in Ireland. The debate had several remarkable features, the most significant an striking in its way was the action of Mr. Russell. But let us take that in its turn. Undoubtedly the occasion was fittingly ushered in by the speech of Mr. Parnell. It was a brief speech, occupying not much longer than half an hour; but it compressed into that space every strong argument in favour of the Bill and an answer to every respectable objection that could be urged against it. The Government, in fact, had no case against the Bill, as they admitted by their subsequent action. They admitted the necessity which the Bill proposed to meet. They only contended that the Bill did not go the right way to meet it. They preferred another way. The way of Mr. Chamberlain, Josephine, which all parties in the House scornfully kicked out the door last year. Led by the nose by Mr. Chamberlain, the Government—I use with apology a phrase of Mr. Bright's—returned like a dog to their vomit. One of Mr. Chamberlain's marionettes from Birmingham, a Mr. Powell Williams, was put up to move an amendment to Mr. Parnell's Bill to this effect—that is to say, to the effect that no Bill to deal with Irish arrears would be satisfactory which did not make the tenant a bankrupt and bring all his other creditors about his ears when he applied for relief from the inequitable debt of the landlord.

The absurd and sinister character of this proposal Mr. Parnell exposed with blasting force. This miserable plank, as he put it, using a fine figure, on which the Government meant to sit and ride out the stormy sea in Ireland. Shopkeepers, farmers, were to be put on the same footing as creditors with the landlords. When, asked Mr. Parnell, had the House of Commons found it necessary to fetter shopkeepers and other creditors to protect the tenants against them as it had the landlords? When were the debts of shopkeepers proved excessive as the rents had been? No difficulty existed between the keepers were not pressing. Very few tenants had lost the interest in their holdings or the shelter of their roof trees owing to the shopkeepers. But now the Government, obeying the lead of their evil genius from Birmingham, proposed to fetter the shopkeeper against the tenant to strike from the tenant's side the friend who had stood between him and starvation, to transform that friend into an enemy taking penal action against him in a Bankruptcy Court, and by way of compensation to the shopkeeper for being forced into this invidious position the shopkeeper's credit was to be injured by his having to put up with a composition for his good debt in order that the landlord might get an instalment on a bad debt to which in justice he had no right.

Mr. Parnell wound up by declaring that the meeting and the muddling of the Government with the Bill was another proof of the impossibility of governing Ireland from Westminster. Anything more grotesque than the putting up of an enemy taking penal action against him in a Bankruptcy Court, and by way of compensation to the shopkeeper for being forced into this invidious position the shopkeeper's credit was to be injured by his having to put up with a composition for his good debt in order that the landlord might get an instalment on a bad debt to which in justice he had no right.

Mr. T. W. Russell then delivered what must be pronounced the most remarkable speech of the debate. He was going to vote against the Government he had hitherto supported and against his own party, and the language in which he spoke was a fraud when he framed it. The other was his Coercion Act was a total failure, either as against the National League or the Plan of Campaign. After a powerful speech from Mr. Healy, who pointed out that the Government, by voting for Mr. Chamberlain's amendment, were committing themselves to the admission that there was a necessity for interfering with arrears, and were accordingly bound to give effect to that opinion by legislation, and after another speech to a similar effect from Sir William Harcourt, the division on the Bill was taken. It was one of the best divisions for the opposition for the session, the numbers being—For the second reading, 243; against, 325; majority against, 85.

Annointed bread.—that is, baking powders in which carbonate of ammonia is used as an ingredient, and which exhale an odor of ammonia when heated—are classed by many eminent physicians and sanitarians as superior to all others. Professor Hassell, of London, who is recognized as highest authority on the subject of food hygiene, comments in the strongest terms the use of carbonate of ammonia as a leavening agent, stating its great advantage to be in its perfect volatility, which permits it to be, by the heat of baking, entirely thrown into leaving gas whereby the bread is raised. The experiment with heat would seem to indicate the superior, not the inferior, value of such baking powder. The little heat that is imparted to it when heated over a gas jet, lamp, or stove, suffices to resolve the carbonate of ammonia into leaving gas and throw it off. The first heat of baking, therefore, will effectively develop all the gas, thoroughly filling the loaf and dissipate the gas-producing ingredients of a powder of this kind; and this is the highest test of a perfect baking powder. Where other alkalies alone are used they are not infrequently retained, unresolved, through the whole process of baking, and remain an unwholesome ingredient in the finished bread. The carbonate of ammonia cannot be used as a substitute for cream of tartar.

My love was like a lily fair, Low drooping in the suit air, My heart was torn with grief and care, I loved her well.

But lo! the wren grows and grows; My love now like a blooming rose, How bright her face with beauty glows, I dare not tell.

The wandering bee would stop to stp, The nectar of her perfect lip, 'Twas Dr. Pierce's Favorite Prescription Wrought the spell.

Gold Mines are very uncertain property; for every panning mine a hundred exists that do not pay. But if you write to Hallett & Co., Portland, Maine, you will receive, free, full particulars about their new business, and learn how some have made over \$50 in a single day at it. You can live at home, and earn from \$5 to \$25 and upwards per day wherever you are located. Both sexes; all ages. Capital not required; you are started free. Send your address, and all will be proved to you. Do not delay in getting relief for the little folks. Mother Graves' Worm Expeller is a pleasant and sure cure. If you love your child why do you let it suffer when a remedy is so near at hand?



Madame Barat.

FOUNDRESS OF THE SOCIETY OF THE SACRED HEART OF JESUS. Her Birth and Early Education—Her Vocation and its Great Result.

SPREAD OF HER SOCIETY IN AMERICA—HER DEATH AND BURIAL—SERIES TAKEN FOR HER CANONIZATION—INVESTIGATION OF THE ALLEGED MIRACLE WORKED UPON THE DAUGHTER OF JUDGE BAKEWELL.

In the small town of Joigny, in Burgundy, and a little more than a century ago, the subject of the present sketch was born. The house in which this historic event occurred was a plain two-story building of five rooms; behind it was a small yard having in its centre a square plot planted with shrubs and flowers. To-day her name is known in every land, and her daughter in religion are domiciled in academies whose roominess and architectural beauty are unsurpassed, and whose surroundings suggest the garden in whose prime innocence she was born.

The growth of the mustard seed will be a marvel to the end of time. Sophie Barat was born during the night of the 12th of December, 1779. Her parents were poor and depended for a livelihood upon the cultivation of a small vineyard and such money as the father earned at his trade.

Jacques Barat was a cooper and a worthy man. He ever acted with truthfulness and integrity and strictly performed his religious duties, but his education was very limited. Besides nature made him dull, and so Madeleine Fofie, his wife, a woman of cleverness and somewhat cultivated intellect and of over-riding sensibility, found in her married life the keenest suffering which, however, she bore with religious resignation. Unbounded love for her children partially filled this aching void in her heart and sometimes she would say to them: "Oh, my dear children, you will never know what you have cost me." On such occasions she would redouble her caresses in the hope of assuaging the grief of her mother, which indeed she did not understand but which led her to feel that domestic life had secret trials that deeply wound; and such reflections, so early made, imparted a thoughtful and an earnestness to a character naturally buoyant and gay. We have it on her own statement that when she was only seventeen months old she was conscious of her existence. Upon one so sensitive the solemn act of receiving Holy Communion for the first time made a strong impression. She was then but in her tenth year and yet wonderfully enlightened soul was stirred by these words of Christ: "If any one loves his father or mother more than Me, he is not worthy of Me;" and these others: "Whosoever has left house, or brother or sister, or father, or mother, for My sake, shall receive a hundredfold, and possess eternal life." They sounded to her like a warning and with feelings of dread she determined to heed them. Three years later, in 1792, at the wedding of her sister, she openly declared her intention of consecrating herself to God. It was an unbiased resolution since up to this and for a long time after she was not acquainted with any nun, and it was a heroic resolution, for the reign of terror was then fully established and her prospect was a prison cell or the scaffold. Providence interfered, however, and her intention was not put into effect until the storm of blood had passed from her unhappy country.

Endowed as she was with so many natural and spiritual graces, Sophie required a director and she found him in her own family. Young Louis Barat, after hard study in the college of Joigny, which he left at the age of seventeen, having borne away all the prizes of his school, then received the tonsure of a priest. He entered the seminary of Sens, where, at the age of twenty-two, he was ordained sub-deacon, and having completed his theology, then became professor of mathematics, while waiting for ordination, at the college where he first studied. During this time he discovered with

astonishment the rare qualities of his young sister, and felt that a great duty devolved on him, that of training her soul for God. He, therefore, undertook her education, and devoted himself to it with the generous, though rather austere, zeal which belonged to his character. Under his stern though sweet guidance Sophie's mind developed itself so rapidly that she soon mastered the elements of scholastic knowledge. Step by step he was led to extend the sphere of her studies. He taught her Latin and soon she was able to read the classics in their original texts. This opened a world of delight to the eager young girl. His elevated, deep, and religious mind, and his exquisite descriptions of the beauties of nature, filled her with admiration. "I was a Virgilian, more than a Christian, at that time," she said, in alluding to this youthful enthusiasm. She learned Greek also, and translated Homer. These studies aroused in her sentiments and thoughts which seemed to feed her innate craving for ideal beauty and moral grandeur, but which first and highest benefit was to awaken in Sophie's soul lofty and boundless aspirations which God alone could satisfy. She was conscious of this beauty, and some time afterwards we observe her saluting from the shore of Adriatic that fair Grecian land, that house of beauty and art, and yet in the midst of her enthusiasm thanking Him for His higher revelation, and animating her to train souls in the knowledge and love of holier ideals.

Subsequently Sophie removed to Paris with her gifted brother and thus advanced a step nearer the great destiny God had in store for her. Obeying the impulse which these first and highest benefits was to awaken in Sophie's soul lofty and boundless aspirations which God alone could satisfy. She was conscious of this beauty, and some time afterwards we observe her saluting from the shore of Adriatic that fair Grecian land, that house of beauty and art, and yet in the midst of her enthusiasm thanking Him for His higher revelation, and animating her to train souls in the knowledge and love of holier ideals.

Her Birth and Early Education—Her Vocation and its Great Result.

SPREAD OF HER SOCIETY IN AMERICA—HER DEATH AND BURIAL—SERIES TAKEN FOR HER CANONIZATION—INVESTIGATION OF THE ALLEGED MIRACLE WORKED UPON THE DAUGHTER OF JUDGE BAKEWELL.

In the small town of Joigny, in Burgundy, and a little more than a century ago, the subject of the present sketch was born. The house in which this historic event occurred was a plain two-story building of five rooms; behind it was a small yard having in its centre a square plot planted with shrubs and flowers. To-day her name is known in every land, and her daughter in religion are domiciled in academies whose roominess and architectural beauty are unsurpassed, and whose surroundings suggest the garden in whose prime innocence she was born.

Jacques Barat was a cooper and a worthy man. He ever acted with truthfulness and integrity and strictly performed his religious duties, but his education was very limited. Besides nature made him dull, and so Madeleine Fofie, his wife, a woman of cleverness and somewhat cultivated intellect and of over-riding sensibility, found in her married life the keenest suffering which, however, she bore with religious resignation. Unbounded love for her children partially filled this aching void in her heart and sometimes she would say to them: "Oh, my dear children, you will never know what you have cost me." On such occasions she would redouble her caresses in the hope of assuaging the grief of her mother, which indeed she did not understand but which led her to feel that domestic life had secret trials that deeply wound; and such reflections, so early made, imparted a thoughtful and an earnestness to a character naturally buoyant and gay. We have it on her own statement that when she was only seventeen months old she was conscious of her existence. Upon one so sensitive the solemn act of receiving Holy Communion for the first time made a strong impression. She was then but in her tenth year and yet wonderfully enlightened soul was stirred by these words of Christ: "If any one loves his father or mother more than Me, he is not worthy of Me;" and these others: "Whosoever has left house, or brother or sister, or father, or mother, for My sake, shall receive a hundredfold, and possess eternal life." They sounded to her like a warning and with feelings of dread she determined to heed them. Three years later, in 1792, at the wedding of her sister, she openly declared her intention of consecrating herself to God. It was an unbiased resolution since up to this and for a long time after she was not acquainted with any nun, and it was a heroic resolution, for the reign of terror was then fully established and her prospect was a prison cell or the scaffold. Providence interfered, however, and her intention was not put into effect until the storm of blood had passed from her unhappy country.

Endowed as she was with so many natural and spiritual graces, Sophie required a director and she found him in her own family. Young Louis Barat, after hard study in the college of Joigny, which he left at the age of seventeen, having borne away all the prizes of his school, then received the tonsure of a priest. He entered the seminary of Sens, where, at the age of twenty-two, he was ordained sub-deacon, and having completed his theology, then became professor of mathematics, while waiting for ordination, at the college where he first studied. During this time he discovered with

astonishment the rare qualities of his young sister, and felt that a great duty devolved on him, that of training her soul for God. He, therefore, undertook her education, and devoted himself to it with the generous, though rather austere, zeal which belonged to his character. Under his stern though sweet guidance Sophie's mind developed itself so rapidly that she soon mastered the elements of scholastic knowledge. Step by step he was led to extend the sphere of her studies. He taught her Latin and soon she was able to read the classics in their original texts. This opened a world of delight to the eager young girl. His elevated, deep, and religious mind, and his exquisite descriptions of the beauties of nature, filled her with admiration. "I was a Virgilian, more than a Christian, at that time," she said, in alluding to this youthful enthusiasm. She learned Greek also, and translated Homer. These studies aroused in her sentiments and thoughts which seemed to feed her innate craving for ideal beauty and moral grandeur, but which first and highest benefit was to awaken in Sophie's soul lofty and boundless aspirations which God alone could satisfy. She was conscious of this beauty, and some time afterwards we observe her saluting from the shore of Adriatic that fair Grecian land, that house of beauty and art, and yet in the midst of her enthusiasm thanking Him for His higher revelation, and animating her to train souls in the knowledge and love of holier ideals.

hidden in Jesus Christ that it occupied notice. But a change soon came—Mdlle. Loquet resigned her position as superior at the request of Father Varin and Madame Barat was made her successor. This honor was bestowed upon her at the early age of twenty-three, and the subsequent sixty-five years of her life go to show that it was bestowed wisely. She died of congestion of the brain on the 29th of May, 1855.

It would be impossible to trace within a short space the history of her many and great travels and the difficulties and interesting incidents which attended the foundation of her Order; suffice it to say that under her care and direction it gained a foothold in every part of the globe. It may not be uninteresting to read the account of the beginning of the order in this country as it has a local importance of more than usual moment at the present time.

On the 14th of January, 1817, Monsignor Dubourg, Bishop of Louisiana, who was then at Paris, paid a visit to Mother General Barat.

It so happened that the portress of the day was Madame Duchesne, who for a long while back had been earnestly importuning the Mother for permission to found a house in America. She opened the door to him, and went to announce his visit. She could not help but to Mother Barat: "This is the hour of Providence. I do beseech you, dear Mother, do not lose the opportunity. You have only to say one word: I implore you, say it." The Mother answered: "My child, if Monsigneur gives me an opening, I can talk over the subject with him, but I shall know by that sign that is God's will."

In that first interview, the Bishop did not allude to the subject. He only proposed to say Mass the next day in the chapel. After mass, Mother Barat sat and conversed with him whilst he breakfasted, and he began at once to speak of America and his diocese, and then said how glad he would be to have Daughters of the Sacred Heart there. Mother Barat replied: "When such a thing becomes possible, Monsigneur, I shall have some one quite ready to go," and she spoke to him of her friend's wish. The Bishop asked to see her and Madame Duchesne was sent for. She felt that she had a word to say. All she could do was to kneel at the Bishop's feet and ask his blessing.

This brief interview filled both the Bishop and herself with hope, and she found that from that very moment a pain in the side she had suffered from for fifteen years suddenly disappeared. Light and strength seemed to have both been simultaneously vouchsafed to her, but nothing was yet decided. Many difficulties attended the affair, and as the Bishop was leaving Paris for a little while, the ultimate decision was delayed till his return.

Monsieur Dubourg was the son of a French colonist in San Domingo. He was brought to France in his childhood; and having had an early vocation for the priesthood, he was ordained on the eve of the Revolution, and placed at the head of the school of Isay, by Father Emery, the Superior of the venerable Society of St. Sulpice, to which he belonged. Father Dubourg narrowly escaped the rage of the September assassins, and took refuge in Spain. He sailed thence to America, where the Sulpicians had founded a college at Baltimore. Here he began his apostolic ministry and his work of education, first directing the College of Georgetown and then building that of St. Mary's, Baltimore. Eminent gifts for the direction of souls, this saintly Bishop, had been the director of the holy Elizabeth Seton, and founded, in conjunction with her, the Institute of the Sisters of Charity in America. But he was above all things a missionary and after laboring greatly in the South, he was named Vicar Apostolic of New Orleans, and in 1815, the termination of the war between America and England, permitted him to go to Europe. He was consecrated Bishop at Rome, and thence returned to France.

His next visit found Mother Barat still living, and he was kind enough to appear, guessed what was going on, threw herself on her knees before her superior and exclaimed: "Give your consent, dear Mother, give your consent." After a moment's prayer, the consent was given and joy reigned. The American mission had been carried by storm.

Four companions met with Madame Duchesne on the 21st of March, 1818. The Bishop had sailed on the 27th of June the preceding year, in a vessel which Louis XVIII had placed at his disposal. After a journey of three months' duration which is now made in a week, and full of perils and trials, they landed at New Orleans. After a short stay here at the Convent of the Ursulines they began their five weeks' trip up the Mississippi, and arrived here in St. Louis, on the 22nd of August, 1818. It goes without saying that St. Louis was a small place at that time. From here they proceeded at the Bishop's command to St. Charles which was then nothing but a collection of huts. The population was composed of Creoles, French, Canadian, German and Irish emigrants. Native savages now and then appeared there, "more easily attracted by liquor than by sermons." It is difficult to realize that such was the humble beginning in our midst of the community which to-day has a home in every representative city of our country. The age of miracles is certainly not past.

It is the firm belief of the daughters of Mother Barat, that she is with the saints. Supernatural revelations of this seem to be not wanting. A religious saw her in a dream surrounded by a dazzling light and holding in her hand a rosary containing many diamond beads as she had founded houses. Another beheld her entering heaven accompanied by the spouses she had given to our Lord. At Sarra, in Spain, she was said to have appeared to the priest who was offering up the Holy Sacrifice on the day of the restoration of vows by the apostles, and to have charged him to tell her daughters that she was present amongst them and would joyfully offer their vows to the Lord. From different parts of the world have come accounts of cures effected by the relics and prayers of this servant of God. Naturally enough some of these were from our city which occupied so large a part of her thoughts during life. At present a commission, presided over

by Archbishop Kenrick, is investigating the circumstances of the sudden and as yet unexplained case which a daughter of Judge Bakewell, of this city, experienced some years ago. A hip disease, pronounced incurable by Drs. Bohlmann and Gregory, was immediately eradicated by the application of a piece of the habit of Mother Mary. The result of the investigation will be forwarded to Rome to aid the effort which is being made to have her declared worthy of public devotion.

Leo XII. approved her Institute; may it be for Leo XIII. to crown her life!

**THE CATHOLIC RECORD**  
Published Weekly at 421 and 423 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.  
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.  
Editor—REV. GEO. H. NORTHGRAVE,  
Author of "Missions of Modern Ireland."  
FRANCIS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor.  
Messrs. DONAT CROWE, LUKE KING and JOHN NICH are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transmit all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.  
Agents for Ottawa—E. J. Coffey, Esq.  
Agents for Alexandria, Glenora and London—Mr. Donald A. McDonald.  
Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion.  
Approved by the Bishop of London, and recommended by the Archbishop of St. Boniface, the Bishops of Ottawa, Hamilton, Kingston, and Pelee, and leading Catholic Clergy men throughout the Dominion.

**Catholic Record.**  
London, Ont., April 14th, 1888.

We are happy to be able to announce that His Lordship Bishop Walsh is rapidly regaining strength, and in a short time will leave New York for his episcopal city.

**NEW DEVELOPMENTS.**

One of the most noteworthy events of the discussion on Mr. Parnell's Arrears' Bill, was the position taken by Mr. T. W. Russell, who has hitherto been a most servile supporter of the Coercionist Government. In the debate on Mr. Parnell's Arrears' Bill, he displayed a sudden and unexpected independence, declaring himself utterly disgusted with the Coercion policy, and advocating Mr. Parnell's Bill with unlooked-for vehemence. Ulster had, without Mr. Russell, a majority of one in the house favorable to the Nationalist cause, but Mr. Russell's attitude indicates that Protestant Ulster is fast opening its eyes to the fact that Ireland's cause is not the cause of Catholicity against Protestantism, but that of a people kept in abject poverty and suffering by an oppressive landlordism, independently of the religious tenets of the oppressed.

Mr. Russell told the House that he would vote against the Government on Mr. Parnell's bill, and that he would entirely forget his own party, (the Liberal Unionists,) with whom he had voted hitherto. The Conservatives, he said, had displayed the utmost indifference to the welfare of the Irish people, and the landlords had been mercilessly faithless to duty, issuing eviction notices by wholesale.

Their conduct is the danger which threatened to dissolve the Union between England and Ireland, and which bodes ruin and destruction to the people of the latter country. He had voted before to make evictions easy to the landlords, because he trusted that they would be discreet, but he would never again trust to their discretion. With shame, he acknowledged, "that he was himself partly responsible for the shower of eviction notices which had recently fallen upon the Irish tenants, like a mild April shower indeed, but they would blossom into a November hurricane of evictions."

He quoted numerous instances in which landlords had entered eviction suits against their tenants because the latter had entered the Courts to obtain the modicum of justice which the Courts are willing to grant. Col. Sanderson asked for the names, but Mr. Russell answered: "Ah, the hon. gentleman always refuses to give names when he is asked for them from the Irish benches. I will not give names in this case because I am unwilling to place any Irish tenants under the mercy of Irish landlords."

The Liberals and Nationalists loudly cheered Mr. Russell, while the Conservatives and Liberal-Unionists gave vent to angry murmurs. Mr. Chamberlain, especially, was much annoyed, as Mr. Russell formally thus repudiated his leadership.

Mr. Russell's concluding words were uttered with peculiar vehemence, though, indeed, it was difficult to say that one part was more vigorously delivered than another, in a speech which was throughout characterized by extraordinary earnestness and vigor. He said:

"You will have to-day a sight never before witnessed in this house. You will have all the members from Ireland, save and except the landlord party, going into the lobby with the member for Cork, while you will have the Liberal and Radical Unionists, going into the other lobby to buttress up the worst phase of Irish landlordism which has cursed Ireland since the days of the Tudors, and which will repeat the Union, as sure as you live."

Dozens of Liberals crowded round Mr. Russell when he sat down to congratulate him on his own and Mr. Lea's conversion to the side of the Irish tenantry. Mr. Lea having seconded him in his course.

If these two remain faithful to the Nationalist cause, the Ulster majority for Tenant Right and Home Rule will be

free in the present house; and, certainly, if vehemence and vigor are any indication of strong conviction, Mr. Russell and Mr. Lea will persevere in the course which they have thus marked out for themselves.

The Pope has been hitherto the great bugbear which the opponents of Home Rule flaunted before the eyes of the Ulster Orangemen to divert them from taking sides with the Nationalists. They were told by Mr. Chamberlain, and Lords Salisbury and Hartington, that Home Rule means Rome Rule, and such minor lights as the Rev. Mr. Magill among themselves, and Rev. J. D. Fulton in Toronto, have repeated this to satiety. But the Ulster people will not long be hoodwinked by such pretences. They must discover that it is not the Pope who is evicting them from their homesteads, and as straws show which way the wind blows, the bold utterances of Mr. Russell, which are, undoubtedly, the expression of the opinions of a class, prove that the hold which the Tory Government have hitherto had on the people of Ulster is relaxing. They will no longer be able to boast of the "loyalty" of Ulster; meaning by "loyalty" a readiness to submit to tyrannical measures emanating from alien rulers at Westminster.

The Nationalist Press are not over jubilant, however, at Mr. Russell's course. They are justified by his antecedents in looking with suspicion on his sudden conversion to their side. £1000 per annum have just been voted as Col. King Harman's salary for filling a post which he has until now filled through pure patriotism (!) and it is known that Mr. Russell desired this post, with the salary. It is, therefore, quite possible, that Mr. Russell is throwing the dice to gain a prize!

In a letter to the Times he seems to throw out a hint that he is purchasable still by the Combination Cabinet. He says:

"If the Union is to be maintained in the interests of Irish landlordism and Castle officialism, I shall speedily make my mind up about the Union. If, on the contrary, the Union is to be maintained for the benefit of the whole people, and if Parliament will remember that there are loyal tenantry, loyal artisans, loyal traders, and loyal laborers, as well as loyal landlords, then I shall continue to fight for the Union."

Will the Government pay him a price such as he requires? It is possible they may do so to bring him back to his allegiance; but whether they do so or not, the ball has been set rolling in Protestant Ulster, the Protestant tenantry have been told that their best interests are linked with the National cause, and even Mr. Russell's delinquency and recency to the cause of which he has declared himself from henceforth a determined adherent, may not be sufficient to stem the torrent which he has put in motion.

On Mr. Parnell's bill, the Government majority was only 85, notwithstanding that several of the opposition are kept from voting by being detained in Mr. Balfour's jails. The hundred, and more, in which they gloried at the opening of the present Parliament has significantly dwindled down.

**THE TABLES TURNED.**

In the extermination campaign on the Luggscurran estates of Lord Lansdowne, last spring, a forge belonging to Edward Whelan, a blacksmith, was seized by His Lordship. Mr. Whelan brought an action for its recovery, as his rent had always been paid. Lord Lansdowne put in the plea that the forge was on his property and that he had a right to retain possession. The action resulted in a verdict for Mr. Whelan, and on St. Patrick's day the sheriff gave Mr. Whelan possession of the forge. A large crowd of people assembled to witness "Lord Lansdowne's eviction," and Mr. Whelan was loudly cheered on resuming possession of the forge.

**JUDGE OLIVIER.**

We are happy to inform our readers that the choice of the government has fallen on Mr. L. A. Olivier, of Ottawa, to fill the vacant County Judgeship of Prescott and Russell. Mr. Olivier is a young French Canadian lawyer of great talent, a native of the County of Russell, an alumnus of the College of Ottawa, and a gentleman enjoying the widest measure of popularity in the whole Ottawa Country. Judge Olivier combines with profound legal knowledge and accurate acquaintance with the French and English languages, an uprightness and sense of honor that will make him an invaluable magistrate. We congratulate our friend on his promotion and wish him many long years of judicial life. We are furthermore happy to announce, in connection with Judge Olivier's appointment, that his successor at the bar of Ottawa will be our clever and scholarly young friend Mr. M. J. Gorman, formerly of Pembroke. Mr. Gorman, as possessor of the same excellent qualities and qualifications that won for Mr. Olivier early prominence and rapid promotion, will admirably fill the vacancy that the latter gentleman's elevation to the Bench has made. Assiduous, honorable and up-

right, our young friend deserves the hearty support and encouragement of the people of Ottawa, to whom we earnestly commend him as the deservedly chosen and eminently fitted successor of the newly-appointed and universally-respected Judge of the United Counties of Prescott and Russell.

**THE FRIENDS OF IRELAND.**

At a banquet given in Cannon Street Hotel on St. Patrick's night, in reply to the toast "the friends of Ireland," Canon Byrne, of Boston, made an eloquent speech. He said he remembered the time when hardly one Boston paper would say a good word for Home Rule, but now there is hardly a paper that is not favorable to Ireland's cause. The change he attributes to Mr. Gladstone, who has induced thousands of Americans to study the Irish question, and to study it necessarily results in making advocates for Ireland's cause. Mr. Richard Eves responded on behalf of Ireland's English friends. He said that the more the English people know of Ireland, the more they sympathize with the sorely down-trodden people of that country.

**J. D. FULTON IN TORONTO.**

The melodorous Justin D. Fulton is prosecuting his anti-Catholic lecture course in Toronto. To the credit of the Toronto press, it must be said, that, knowing as they did the man's antecedents, they gave him, on the whole, that cool reception which he deserves. Even the *Mail*, though, perhaps, at first, willing to give him some encouragement, grew disgusted with his filth and falsehood, and latterly abstained from giving him the full amount of free advertising which at first it seemed willing to accord to him. This excited Dr. Fulton's ire, and on Tuesday, the 3rd inst., he expressed his indignation at the press of Toronto by having stated that certain portions of his lecture on Monday evening were unfit for publication." The *Mail's* report of his lecture adds, "that throughout the evening the eloquent divine (!) read a lecture to the newspapers of the city, declaring that he never found a place where there is such a cringing fear of Rome as in Toronto."

He then asked the ladies who had been present the previous evening to hold up their hands if they considered his remarks as unfit for publication. Of course, he knew well that any ladies capable of appreciating what is fit to be listened to, and who might have been present hearing such remarks, at the former, would not be at the succeeding lecture, so that he was perfectly safe in making this appeal. No hands were held up to condemn him, and this, forthwith, is regarded by him as a glorious vindication!

The *Mail* of the 5th inst. had an editorial in reply to Dr. Fulton's abuse of the press. This article says significantly: Dr. Fulton "asserts that the papers are afraid of the influence of the Roman Catholic Church. It would, perhaps, be more correct to say that they are afraid of the moral influence of his lectures upon their readers." Coming from the *Mail* this is indeed an unkind cut. As to the subject on which Dr. Fulton spoke, and the manner in which he maintained his position, the *Mail* adds: "So far as we can see, he confines himself mainly to hurling charges of immorality against priests and nuns. That sort of invective serves no good purpose. It lacks the essential element of fair play."

The editor explains that such a mode of procedure can have no result either in the conversion of Catholics to Protestantism, or the prevention of Protestants from becoming Catholics, for "the humblest Catholic layman is, from the nature of the case, a more competent judge (of this matter) than any Protestant polemist." Also: "Every intelligent person, whatever his creed may be, knows of his own common sense, that in this age, the Roman Catholic Church could not endure for twelve months were her altars manned by adulterers, or her convents peopled with harlots."

Thus the *Mail* gives the lie direct to Mr. Fulton. That journal, however, has a matter at heart on which he would like some information from the liar, if he has any to give. It would like to be enlightened as regards how the increasing influence of the French-Canadians in our Dominion can be counteracted. If Mr. Fulton will only give light on this subject, the *Mail* agrees to take him to his embrace with all his faults:

"We shall be grateful to Dr. Fulton if he can give us any hints or suggestions regarding this matter. But if he has nothing better to offer than obscenities about priests and nuns, then, with all respect to his cloth, he may as well go back to Brooklyn."

In short, if Mr. Fulton will only take his cue from the *Mail*, that journal will enthusiastically exclaim with Anthony Chaussewitz: "I taught him. I trained him. This is the heir of my bringing up. I worked for this: I hoped for this; it has been the great end and aim of my life."

Against the slanders of this Fulton, it is unnecessary to say one word in defence of the pious and self-sacrificing ladies who

have devoted their lives in Catholic convents, to the purposes of charity and benevolence towards all. Their works speak for themselves, and have brought forth acknowledgments even from their bitterest enemies, concerning their disinterestedness. The English soldiers of the Crimea, and the Americans engaged in the great civil war are equally ready to attest the heroic virtues exhibited by devoted nuns, whether on the battlefields, in the hospitals, or in their oratories. We shall, however, append the following letter from a well known gentleman of Toronto, a Methodist, who does justice both to the nuns and to J. D. Fulton:

**DR. FULTON'S MISSION.**  
To the Editor of the *Mail*.  
Sir,—Rev. J. D. Fulton, D. D., of Brooklyn, N. Y., comes here ostensibly as one whose mission is to preach the "glad tidings" of the Christian religion—but really to find in Toronto audiences a receptacle for the vilest character of filth this people have ever been called on to witness. His main object here, as throughout the greater part of his life, is to attack the institutions of the Roman Catholic Church, sparing not even the defenceless Sisters connected with the various convents of the country. The first principles of manly gallantry should have prompted this man to bestir himself before his depraved and lustful imagination had reached these self-sacrificing women with his scoured insinuations.

I may say, although I have no doubt the fact is well known, that I am a Protestant, and will yield to no man in my allegiance and veneration for the simple truths of the plan of salvation as understood in the Methodist denomination. But if my religion could find any strength or sustenance in such rhetorical carion as Dr. Fulton presents to his hearers, I would utterly despair of any sanctifying results following in the wake of the Gospel of Christ. A defence from my hands of any of the institutions of the Roman Catholic Church is unnecessary. The great mass of the Protestant public in this country have learned to respect them. Of the Sisters of Charity (whom Dr. Fulton refers to as the nuns) I know as the Christian people of Canada know, that where poverty, misery, sickness and death most do congregate, there are to be found these noble women, ministering in kindness and love, without fee or reward, and putting to shame the philanthropic efforts of many Protestant communities. It is impossible that in the hearts of such could exist the wickedness and sin charged by this itinerant vendor of infamous falsehood. Protestants and Catholics in this country have long since learned to respect each other, and the Protestant efforts of many Protestant communities to contempt the utterances of such as this so-called Christian minister of Brooklyn. Toronto seems to be the dumping ground for American swindlers, defaulters, thieves and scoundrels. Their company, in their conduct, has a more elevating influence than any reverend gentlemen of the character of the subject of this communication. If further evidence is desired as to the questionable purity of mind of Dr. Fulton it is found in the circumstances surrounding his efforts to have a certain work published in Boston. The publishers, upon being interviewed by Dr. Fulton, entered into a contract to print a book for him without reading the manuscript. It was sent to the composing room. Early the following day the manager was informed that the compositor had refused to set the type, so utterly filthy and obscene was the composition. The doctor was informed of the state of affairs and the copy was returned to him. He threatened the publishers with an action for breach of contract, but when told to "go shamefully restrained. Since his arrival in Toronto publishers here have refused to put in print his filthy literature. It is high time the mask was drawn from off the face of such debased immorality. He and his false and disgusting utterances are more becoming to the house of the "strange women" than the platform of any public hall in this fair city.

Yours, etc.,  
W. T. R. PRESTON,  
Toronto, April 2.

Mr. Preston's letter makes it unnecessary to say more on this subject. However, we may remark that there are Torontoians who identify themselves with the infamous Fulton, by endorsing his black clamors. Of Inspector Jas. Hughes and Thos. N. Duntney we have already spoken in our column. Since the appearance of Mr. Preston's letter, Dr. Wilde and City Commissioner Coatsworth have made themselves his boon companions, and in the *Mail* of the 5th inst. Chas. Hudson endorses him as one "who has sacrificed a good position and a comfortable home to tell us the truth."

Dr. Fulton's complaints that some of his city audiences had not contributed sufficient to pay his expenses are enough to show to what extent the spirit of self-sacrifice actuates him. It is a noble testimony to the grand character of the Catholic Church, that only such men as this Fulton can be induced to preach No-Popery crusades.

**FALSE PRETENCES.**

The following, from the Philadelphia American, will show what Americans think of the Coercionist pretence that if Ireland were to have Home Rule, the Protestant minority would be persecuted. This is the bugaboo which is persistently brought forward to scare the timid old women of England, and "Protestant Ulster," wherever that is:

"It is assumed by Protestant alarmists that every country in which Roman Catholics have the majority must witness the same intolerance of the Protestant minority as characterized the era of the Counter-Reformation. It is taken for granted that while the spirit of the age has put an end to the parallel intolerance in Protestant countries—to the penal laws against Irish

Roman Catholics for instance—that no such change has been wrought in Roman Catholic countries. This argument is used freely in opposition to allowing Ireland Home Rule. It might be asked to what unfairness the Protestant minority of Belgium has been subjected since that country cut loose from Protestant Holland in 1830? Austria is a case equally notable. Nineteen-twentieths of the people of the Austrian provinces are Roman Catholics. A member of the national legislature has proposed a law, which would make Roman Catholicism the basis of public education, though not to nearly the same extent as the penal laws made the creed of the Episcopal Church the basis of public education in Ireland. He would not make it penal for any but Roman Catholics to open a school, as those laws made it penal for any but Protestants. But he would enact that the catechism of that Church be taught to all the schools supported by the State. Yet the bill has not the remotest chance of becoming a law. The most ardent Roman Catholics deplore it as ill advised and inopportune. The majority simply scorn the proposal."

**ST. PETER IN ROME.**

There is a class of Protestant polemist who are constantly proclaiming their insatiable longing for truth, yet who love to maintain any thesis, however preposterous, which will, as they imagine, give trouble to Catholics to refute it. Not long since, Dr. Kellogg, a Presbyterian minister of Toronto, in a sermon against the Pope's supremacy, on which we at the time made some comments, admitted that the words of Christ: "on this rock I will build my Church," refer to St. Peter, as indeed they evidently do. However, the Doctor found a host of adversaries who rose up against him with letters in the papers, declaring that this was yielding too much to Rome. In a letter dated 5th March, Dr. Kellogg answered one of these writers thus:

"Perhaps I may misapprehend these words, but they seem to me to express a principle fatal to all candid interpretation of Scripture. I may say that I have not the slightest sympathy with that old dogmatic school of interpretation which subordinated interpretation to dogma. . . . I would therefore never bring myself to say of any interpretation that, because of its supposed bearing on any dogma, it should never be given upon any grounds whatever."

Notwithstanding this fair declaration, Dr. Kellogg, in another part of his sermon, endeavors to make it appear that St. Peter was not in Rome, at least during the life of St. Paul, though he says "there is some reason from tradition to believe" that "after the martyrdom of Paul" he was there. Dr. Justin B. Fulton has also been indoctrinating his Toronto audiences with the notion that St. Peter was never in Rome, and the assertion was fully applauded.

Of course the object of this is to make it appear that the line of Supreme Pontiff, the successors of St. Peter as Bishop of Rome, are but a myth, with no claim to the successorship to St. Peter. As the subject is of great interest to Catholics, in view of the Pope's succession to St. Peter, we propose to say a few words here concerning it.

Dr. Kellogg will have it that St. Peter's visit to Rome was, according to tradition, after St. Paul's martyrdom. He concedes then, that St. Paul was martyred at Rome, and this is, truly, what tradition attests. But the same tradition attests that St. Peter first preached the Gospel there, and that he too was martyred in the same persecution with St. Paul, and even that the martyrdom of the two Apostles took place on the same day.

The undeniable testimony of the early Fathers and of extant monuments of the catacombs is to this effect and to the effect that these two Apostles were co-laborers in establishing the Church in Rome. St. Leo the Great speaks of this as a well-known fact: "O Rome, Peter and Paul were the two heroes by whom the light was all at once made to shine to your view. . . they are your august fathers, your venerable pastors. To them you owe the honor of your heavenly birth. . . Peter and Paul alone have conferred on you this high dignity, have rendered you the holy nation, the chosen people, the sacerdotal and royal city." St. Leo was Pontiff, A. D. 440.

St. Gregory I. states that certain Eastern Christians came to Rome to claim the bones of these two apostles as a treasure belonging to their country. They were in the act of bearing the relics with them, and had deposited them for the night in one of the catacombs outside the city, when they were so terrified by a convulsion of the elements, that they abandoned their project, and the Romans replaced them piously on the spot where they remain to this day.

Pope Damasus, who was Pontiff in A. D. 366, relates these same facts in verse, in an inscription which contains his name as the writer; and the spot on which stands the glorious Church of St. Paul outside the walls of Rome is the very spot where Constantine the Great erected a Church on this Apostles' tomb, and the spot where the grandest of all basilicas is erected over the tomb of St. Peter, in the same on which St. Helen, the mother of Constantine, built a temple in honor of the prince of

the Apostles. There is, in fact, through all the catacombs, the constantly recurring representation of these two apostles, united in life and death, which proves that there was always in the Christian Roman mind a reason for uniting the two in one veneration, which did not exist in the case of other saints, unless they were closely united in the same work, in life and death. This tradition is confirmed by the Roman Martyrology which relates the martyrdom of both in Rome on 29th of June, A. D. 66. It is, therefore, difficult to understand why Dr. Kellogg should agree with the tradition and history which tell of St. Paul's martyrdom, while he rejects the equally conclusive evidence that St. Peter suffered also in Rome during the same general persecution in which Nero caused so many Christians to be put to death. There is the same evidence for both events, and there is absolutely no testimony to show either that St. Peter survived St. Paul, or that he died elsewhere, whether by martyrdom or from natural causes. It would make this article too long to enumerate all the proofs of St. Peter's episcopate in Rome. However, we may mention briefly a few.

St. Irenaeus says that "Peter first (that is before Paul) opened the gate of the heavenly kingdom in Rome by the preaching of the Gospel." This testimony of itself is most conclusive, owing to the nearness of St. Irenaeus to the Apostles themselves and the consequent authenticity of the information possessed by this great Bishop, saint and scholar. Saints Epiphanius and Chrysostom give equally forcible testimony, as also Leo I., Theodoret, the Emperor Theodosius and Paul Orosius.

Eusebius, the father of Church History, says: "Nero sought the death of the Apostles first, as the leaders and standard-bearers of God's people. Paul he condemned to be beheaded, and Peter to be crucified. I consider it unnecessary to seek for testimonies to these facts, for their attestation is to be seen to this day in the remarkable and resplendent monuments which attest them." (Ch. Hist.)

We hear it said, sometimes, and Dr. Kellogg states this as a serious objection to St. Peter's having been in Rome, that the Scripture does not speak of his presence there. If this were the case, the objection would have very little weight, for the Scripture nowhere professes to give a full history of St. Peter: though much of St. Paul's career is given by his companion St. Luke in the Acts of the Apostles, as well as in his own Epistles.

However, there are two very clear references to St. Peter's being in Rome found in Holy Scripture.

From Acts xxviii, 15, we learn that when St. Paul went to Rome to preach the Gospel the brethren who were already in Rome came forth to meet him, and he thanked God for their affectionate reception of him, which gave him great courage." In St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, 1. 8. the flourishing state of religion in Rome is spoken of by that Apostle in the most eulogistic style. Who, then, preached the Gospel in Rome, before St. Paul, if not St. Peter, whom all Tradition points out as the first to have done so! To the testimonies already given, concerning this fact, we may add that of Pappas, who being a disciple of the Apostles, and a priest of Rome, was certainly cognizant of facts of which he was an eye and ear witness. Eusebius takes from the writings of Pappas the statement that "Peter in his first Epistle, which was written from Rome, mentions Mark, and that he calls Rome Babylon, saying 'the church that is at Babylon saluteh you, and so doth Marcus my son.'" 1 Pet. v. 13.

Other early fathers give similar testimony. St. Jerome expressly states that the Babylon here spoken of is Rome, that is, Pagan Rome, just as St. John in the Apocalypse speaks of Pagan Rome under the same name Babylon. This passage of St. Peter is, therefore, the third passage of Holy Writ in which St. Peter's presence in Rome is attested, and not obscurely. Dr. Kellogg is therefore in this guilty of the same distortion of the sense of scripture for which he so strongly censures others.

**REV. JUSTIN B. FULTON.**

The Toronto Ministerial Association have taken under its patronage the obituary book-writer of Brooklyn. At their meeting on Monday last he was introduced to the association, and the report states that he "gave an interesting sketch of his work toward the conversion of Roman Catholics. A cordial vote of thanks to the speaker was then unanimously carried." After which "the meeting was closed with the benediction by Rev. E. A. Stafford."

It is, however, pleasing to notice that not all the Protestant clergy are so loath to decency as to lend encouragement, either to the man, or to the falsehoods he is known to be propagating. The *Christian Register* of Boston, a Unitarian paper, thus speaks of him, and respectable Protestants echo these sentiments:

"We confess to our Catholic contemporary the deep sense of humiliation which Mr. Fulton's course awakens. We assure it that his blatant sensationalism, his arrant bigotry and his coarse attacks upon the Little Sisters of the Poor are as

thoroughly distasteful to number of Protestants as Catholics. Indeed there which Mr. Fulton can infidelity which is quite as Protestantism must suffer.

**CATHOLICITY IN**

The Jubilee offering for the Pope has excited ultra Presbyterians in Edinburgh Seeders per violation of the solemn Church and nation, regven." This is on a par of some of the Presby and the United States, o recognition given to Princes of the Church or by high civil dignitari shows that the spirit of not altogether extinct. imagine their little comstitute the Church whos acceptable to heaven's case, truly the promise ham and to Isaac and to which St. Paul tells us filled in Christ, by the knowledge and efficacy have had small fruit shall all the nations blessed."

Scotland itself appea its Presbyterianism, R icised, the Inspiration being freely denied, t being abandoned i flourishing more surel

In 1778, not more the lica used to assemble holy Mass celebr eminent Bishop Ha about forty in the ci in Inverness shire, 77 and in the shire of M are now in Glasgow city attended by 63 priest there are now se 16 priests, and in Mor two parishes with 2 Scotland there are 281 000 Catholics, so that tioned in the above sta over 1000 souls in his c increase is such in ex able increase of the I when under persecutio God, "multiplied and strong." The Edinbu rest assured that the horrid at "the encroa the Catholic Church, w for the See of Peter, dying out in "bonnie

With pleasure we re the people of Scotland no sympathy with the tions of the Edinburgh

**CATHOLIC E**

The necessity of C dependently even of, religious education, our children, has been in Meriden, Connect School of that town is cally "non-sectarian; teachers, Miss Joseph the teaching of the C of the vile misrepres so frequently found in cal writings. Miss C withdraw her false re-iterating and defou Thus are "non-sectari against the Catholic authorities support Catholics of Meriden to build a big melves, and to support course there will be th indignation among Catholics there pres school of their own religion will be taught

A similar case has tral Grammar School The teacher there, b from anti-Catholic oft-told lies concerni this case an endeavor smooth by stating th allowed to defend th Catholics must eit sulted, or they must a Babel, the result likely be the subvers faith in the minds of there.

Precisely the sam occurred in Ontar lic Separate School if it does not occur reason is that teach aware that Catholics their own hands: the Catholic child practically attendi Even of those who ing the Public Scho are attending schol wherein the children their religion.

From such facts that those few nom endeavoring to thro way of making th they are intended to







