

USE DIAMOND POTASH.

GREAT CLEARANCE SALE.

BOOTS AND SHOES

J. C. SPRAGUE & CO'S.

Look out Monday for our Mammoth Circular, giving Full Particulars.

MARCH, 1885.

W. A. WEEKS & CO.

CASH BUYERS will Save Money by purchasing at Weeks & Co's Cheap Store.

We Guarantee you as many goods for a dollar as any other shop in the city.

A Splendid Stock now on hand, with prices Lower than ever.

WHOLESALE & RETAIL.

W. A. WEEKS & CO.

Ch'town, Feb. 25, 1885

FEBRUARY 18TH, 1885

DECIDED TO MAKE A CHANGE IN OUR BUSINESS!

WILL SELL AT COST FOR 40 DAYS.

Will Sell Balance of Stock on hand on April 1, by Auction, of which due Notice will be Given!

Payment of all Accounts furnished 31st December is Requested

C. ROBERTSON.

Ch'town, Feb. 18th, 1885.

FEBRUARY.

DURING THIS MONTH

J. B. MACDONALD

WILL SELL THE BALANCE OF HIS WINTER STOCK AT

STILL LOWER PRICES!

Bargains in Every Department.

Remnants and Short Ends must be cleared.

Don't fail to call when shopping, as nowhere can cheaper goods be had than at

J. B. MACDONALD'S, Queen Street.

Ch'town, Feb. 10, 1885 - dly wky

CITIZENS IN COUNCIL.

The Taxation Question Discussed.

How can the Burden be Equalized?

And Enough Money Obtained to Keep the City in a Creditable State?

In the City Council Chamber, last evening, a number of citizens met together with His Worship the Mayor and the Councilors, to consider the Civic situation; and talk the matter over. The Mayor presided. He opened the meeting by pointing out the fact that unless Charlottetown be suffered to retrograde to the discredit of its people, more will have to be done by its Corporation than has been done in recent years; and if so, more money will be required; and while owners of real estate complain that the present mode of taxation is unfair and particularly onerous to them, the question is, How is the money to be raised, so that the burden will fall more equitably? It had been suggested that the Council should endeavor to obtain from the Legislature power to levy taxation in the manner that seemed to them best, and judgment upon their action be passed every year by the taxpayers at the polls. It would be well, perhaps, to consider this suggestion.

COUNCILLOR CRABBE submitted a rough estimate of what, in his opinion, would be the expenditure required by the Corporation this year—as follows:—

Table with 2 columns: Item and Amount. Items include City Government, Street lamps, Police department, Fire department, Market House, etc.

Total. \$43,954. In this estimate there was an increase over last year of \$3,300 for the repair of streets, a small increase in the cost of repairing pumps and wells, and also an increase in the amount paid to the City School Board. These increases he deemed necessary; and in round numbers the City Council would require for the service of next year the sum of \$44,000. On the other hand, the sources of revenue would, he feared, be fewer than they were last year, and it would be remembered that last year the actual receipts were only \$39,849.91, while the actual expenditure was \$41,057.31, leaving a deficit of \$1,207.41. Last year they received \$547.50 as rent for Queen's Wharf, but this year it is so much out of repair that little if any revenue can be expected from it. Last year \$506 was received as poll tax; but unless there were Dominion or Local elections, this sum would not be obtained this year. Then there was a considerable amount of fines under the Scott Act, and of vendors' licenses under the Liquor License Act, which has lately been declared ultra vires. This could not be counted on during the present year. Altogether the reductions in the revenue would, according to his estimate, amount to \$4,407.22. The revenue derivable would be:—

Table with 2 columns: Item and Amount. Items include Real Estate, Arrears, City Court, Market tolls and rents, etc.

Leaving about \$10,000 to be made up. The question was: How is this to be done?

A. B. Warburton, Esq., favored the passage of a Bill giving to the Council more general powers of taxation. He also advocated the consolidation of the City laws and bye-laws.

Hon. Daniel Davies thought that to allow the City Council to levy taxes as they pleased, would be to give them great power. Still the Council were the servants of the City and could be turned on every year, if they did not do right. This would be a great check upon them. For his part he thought an income tax the fairest; and it would include those who are best able to pay. As to a poll tax, the Council have now the power to levy it; but it is not collected.

Mr. Davies (continuing) condemned the suggestion that the "turnover" of goods should be taxed.

Archibald Kennedy, Esq., said there were numbers of citizens (householders) who send their children to the schools and enjoy all the advantages of the city, but who do not contribute directly or indirectly one single cent to the city revenue. How are we to meet the persons in question? He would place a tax on their rental, in addition to the tax which the landlords are now compelled to pay, and thus make up a portion of the amount required for schools—say \$4,000 a year.

Charles Palmer, Esq., said that in his opinion the tenant paid indirectly, as would be apparent had there not been a reduction in rents. In his opinion the Legislature would never give the City Council liberty to tax as they chose; and it was therefore useless to talk about it. As to an income tax he would not object to it, if means were taken to have it fairly levied, and he thought something might be got of the poll tax—1500 persons subject to a poll tax of \$3, would pay \$4,500 a year—a considerable item.

Archibald McNeill, Esq., thought the Council should have formulated a scheme of taxation, and submitted it to the meeting. For his part he was in favor of a small tax on those who sent children to school, as in Halifax and other cities. Surely parents would not begrudge a dollar a term for each child receiving instruction in the City Schools. Then there are men who come here with lots of flour, cargoes of coal, etc., and sell them, take the money away in their pockets, pay not a cent in rent or taxes, and walk away. These men, he thought, should be compelled to pay something for the privilege of underselling those who are residents, and as such, subject to the expenses incident to life in a city.

George R. Beer, Esq., remarked that he saw nothing in Mr. Crabbe's estimates about the cost of water for the city. He thought it would be folly to go to the Legislature with a scheme which did not cover all the ground. The water will, when furnished, necessitate the expenditure of a considerable sum in addition to that required for next year.

Councillor McLean said he would like to know the opinion of the meeting as to whether or not they were willing that the Council should levy the taxes as they saw fit, so as to spread the burden and make it as equitable as possible.

Mr. Sutherland (Davies, Sutherland & Meeks) said that to test the feeling of the meeting on this point, he would move that the City Council have leave to apply for unlimited powers of taxation. He thought taxation should embrace all classes of property; and he would oppose the imposition of tolls on persons who may come here to do business, as opposed the principles of free trade and as petty and contemptible. He thought the amount required by the city might be made up somewhat in this way: Real estate levied upon at the rate of one per cent. would yield (say) \$26,000; poll tax of \$3 on all persons over 18 or 21 years of age, \$4,500; a half per cent. on rental would yield \$11,000 more; personal property might be taxed to the extent of \$10,000; and an income tax might be levied for the amount of (say) \$4,000; or, in all, \$55,000 a year. He would have all taxes collected by the City Council and by the same collector.

Hon. D. Davies would not agree to a tax on furniture because it is unproductive property. James Curtis, Esq., thought it a harsh and unfair proceeding to levy a poll tax upon an old man like himself—one who paid on real estate, too. The poll tax, he thought, should be levied on the young men who did not pay in any other way. It is nonsense to think that the Legislature will ever give the City Council liberty to tax as they please. M. P. Hogan, Esq., could not understand why there is such a prejudice against a personal property tax—which is levied in every other city he has visited, and is to his mind just as legitimate an object of taxation as real estate. He would levy 1 per cent. on real estate, and 1/2 per cent. on personal property. F. T. Newbery, Esq., seconded the motion of Mr. Sutherland. He did so for the purpose of having the sense of the meeting tested. This is such a vexed question that he thought it quite impossible for a meeting of this size; and perhaps a suitable scheme of taxation; and he would be well to let the City Council make a levy according to their best judgment, and if they do wrong let the citizens turn them out at the first opportunity. For his part, he thought that some of the pressure should be taken off real estate; and that the young men might well bear a portion of the burden of city taxation. In St. John, young men used to pay \$5 each, a year. He thought also, that something might be done in the way of retrenchment. For instance; the assessors go round every year, would not once in every two or three years be sufficient for all practical purposes? Rob Angus, Esq., said that what the city wanted was a mode of taxation which would realize the amount required, and a means of levying and collecting that would be equitable and efficient. It seemed to him that the system adopted in Ontario would answer our requirements better than what we now have. Their system is that the assessors make valuations every year in the following manner:—They go from house to house. They value (say) Mr. A's real estate at (say) \$1500; personal property (say) \$500; income (say) \$700—assess all over \$400 would be \$300—each dog, \$1; bitch, \$2; (and they see that the tax is collected, by making the owner attach to each dog a brass plate, with the number of license stamped upon it—any dog found without this license is taken in charge by police, and if not claimed within a certain time is killed); horse and carriage, \$3. They leave with each housekeeper a copy of the assessment, with a notice that if he thinks there is anything wrong or unjust he must notify the city clerk within fourteen days that he means to appeal. If he does so, the case is tried before a committee of the City Council appointed for the purpose. If he does not give notice, the assessment stands as it is. Then when they know what the valuation of the property is they strike the rate, and that rate is the same on all classes of property, whether real estate personal, or income. Then as to the means of collection after the rate and amounts are fixed, a notice is served on each taxpayer, informing him what he has to pay, and also notifying him that he will get 2 1/2 per cent. off the bill, and if he does not, proceedings will be taken to recover it. Almost all the taxes are paid within the time, as the proceedings for collection, which are as follows, are very summary: You get notice through the papers that all taxes not paid within a certain time, (which, say 10 days) it will be collected by law, and that process is very simple and efficient. The collector calls and makes a schedule of goods, enough to pay the tax, and puts the notice upon your door to the effect that if not paid within eight days, the goods will be sold to satisfy the claim. The argument that householders should pay part of the school tax because they get the use of the schools just holds as good about the other expenses of our city, as every citizen gets the protection of the fire department, the police, etc.; he also uses our streets and plank walks.

The Ontario system collects all taxes from the householder, not the landlord, and makes the personal property pay, not the land, unless there be no personal property on the land, in which case after taxes are in arrears three years, the land can be sold, or enough to satisfy the claim. The tenant does not go into a house till he finds out if there are arrears of taxes, and if his arrangement is that the landlord has to pay taxes he keeps it out of his rent unless she does. This system seems more equitable as

those who sent children to school, as in Halifax and other cities. Surely parents would not begrudge a dollar a term for each child receiving instruction in the City Schools. Then there are men who come here with lots of flour, cargoes of coal, etc., and sell them, take the money away in their pockets, pay not a cent in rent or taxes, and walk away. These men, he thought, should be compelled to pay something for the privilege of underselling those who are residents, and as such, subject to the expenses incident to life in a city.

George R. Beer, Esq., remarked that he saw nothing in Mr. Crabbe's estimates about the cost of water for the city. He thought it would be folly to go to the Legislature with a scheme which did not cover all the ground. The water will, when furnished, necessitate the expenditure of a considerable sum in addition to that required for next year.

Councillor McLean said he would like to know the opinion of the meeting as to whether or not they were willing that the Council should levy the taxes as they saw fit, so as to spread the burden and make it as equitable as possible.

Mr. Sutherland (Davies, Sutherland & Meeks) said that to test the feeling of the meeting on this point, he would move that the City Council have leave to apply for unlimited powers of taxation. He thought taxation should embrace all classes of property; and he would oppose the imposition of tolls on persons who may come here to do business, as opposed the principles of free trade and as petty and contemptible.

He thought the amount required by the city might be made up somewhat in this way: Real estate levied upon at the rate of one per cent. would yield (say) \$26,000; poll tax of \$3 on all persons over 18 or 21 years of age, \$4,500; a half per cent. on rental would yield \$11,000 more; personal property might be taxed to the extent of \$10,000; and an income tax might be levied for the amount of (say) \$4,000; or, in all, \$55,000 a year. He would have all taxes collected by the City Council and by the same collector.

Hon. D. Davies would not agree to a tax on furniture because it is unproductive property. James Curtis, Esq., thought it a harsh and unfair proceeding to levy a poll tax upon an old man like himself—one who paid on real estate, too. The poll tax, he thought, should be levied on the young men who did not pay in any other way. It is nonsense to think that the Legislature will ever give the City Council liberty to tax as they please.

M. P. Hogan, Esq., could not understand why there is such a prejudice against a personal property tax—which is levied in every other city he has visited, and is to his mind just as legitimate an object of taxation as real estate. He would levy 1 per cent. on real estate, and 1/2 per cent. on personal property.

F. T. Newbery, Esq., seconded the motion of Mr. Sutherland. He did so for the purpose of having the sense of the meeting tested. This is such a vexed question that he thought it quite impossible for a meeting of this size; and perhaps a suitable scheme of taxation; and he would be well to let the City Council make a levy according to their best judgment, and if they do wrong let the citizens turn them out at the first opportunity.

For his part, he thought that some of the pressure should be taken off real estate; and that the young men might well bear a portion of the burden of city taxation. In St. John, young men used to pay \$5 each, a year. He thought also, that something might be done in the way of retrenchment. For instance; the assessors go round every year, would not once in every two or three years be sufficient for all practical purposes?

Rob Angus, Esq., said that what the city wanted was a mode of taxation which would realize the amount required, and a means of levying and collecting that would be equitable and efficient. It seemed to him that the system adopted in Ontario would answer our requirements better than what we now have.

Their system is that the assessors make valuations every year in the following manner:—They go from house to house. They value (say) Mr. A's real estate at (say) \$1500; personal property (say) \$500; income (say) \$700—assess all over \$400 would be \$300—each dog, \$1; bitch, \$2; (and they see that the tax is collected, by making the owner attach to each dog a brass plate, with the number of license stamped upon it—any dog found without this license is taken in charge by police, and if not claimed within a certain time is killed); horse and carriage, \$3. They leave with each housekeeper a copy of the assessment, with a notice that if he thinks there is anything wrong or unjust he must notify the city clerk within fourteen days that he means to appeal.

If he does so, the case is tried before a committee of the City Council appointed for the purpose. If he does not give notice, the assessment stands as it is. Then when they know what the valuation of the property is they strike the rate, and that rate is the same on all classes of property, whether real estate personal, or income. Then as to the means of collection after the rate and amounts are fixed, a notice is served on each taxpayer, informing him what he has to pay, and also notifying him that he will get 2 1/2 per cent. off the bill, and if he does not, proceedings will be taken to recover it. Almost all the taxes are paid within the time, as the proceedings for collection, which are as follows, are very summary: You get notice through the papers that all taxes not paid within a certain time, (which, say 10 days) it will be collected by law, and that process is very simple and efficient. The collector calls and makes a schedule of goods, enough to pay the tax, and puts the notice upon your door to the effect that if not paid within eight days, the goods will be sold to satisfy the claim. The argument that householders should pay part of the school tax because they get the use of the schools just holds as good about the other expenses of our city, as every citizen gets the protection of the fire department, the police, etc.; he also uses our streets and plank walks.

The Ontario system collects all taxes from the householder, not the landlord, and makes the personal property pay, not the land, unless there be no personal property on the land, in which case after taxes are in arrears three years, the land can be sold, or enough to satisfy the claim. The tenant does not go into a house till he finds out if there are arrears of taxes, and if his arrangement is that the landlord has to pay taxes he keeps it out of his rent unless she does. This system seems more equitable as

those who sent children to school, as in Halifax and other cities. Surely parents would not begrudge a dollar a term for each child receiving instruction in the City Schools. Then there are men who come here with lots of flour, cargoes of coal, etc., and sell them, take the money away in their pockets, pay not a cent in rent or taxes, and walk away. These men, he thought, should be compelled to pay something for the privilege of underselling those who are residents, and as such, subject to the expenses incident to life in a city.

George R. Beer, Esq., remarked that he saw nothing in Mr. Crabbe's estimates about the cost of water for the city. He thought it would be folly to go to the Legislature with a scheme which did not cover all the ground. The water will, when furnished, necessitate the expenditure of a considerable sum in addition to that required for next year.

Councillor McLean said he would like to know the opinion of the meeting as to whether or not they were willing that the Council should levy the taxes as they saw fit, so as to spread the burden and make it as equitable as possible.

Mr. Sutherland (Davies, Sutherland & Meeks) said that to test the feeling of the meeting on this point, he would move that the City Council have leave to apply for unlimited powers of taxation. He thought taxation should embrace all classes of property; and he would oppose the imposition of tolls on persons who may come here to do business, as opposed the principles of free trade and as petty and contemptible.

He thought the amount required by the city might be made up somewhat in this way: Real estate levied upon at the rate of one per cent. would yield (say) \$26,000; poll tax of \$3 on all persons over 18 or 21 years of age, \$4,500; a half per cent. on rental would yield \$11,000 more; personal property might be taxed to the extent of \$10,000; and an income tax might be levied for the amount of (say) \$4,000; or, in all, \$55,000 a year. He would have all taxes collected by the City Council and by the same collector.

Hon. D. Davies would not agree to a tax on furniture because it is unproductive property. James Curtis, Esq., thought it a harsh and unfair proceeding to levy a poll tax upon an old man like himself—one who paid on real estate, too. The poll tax, he thought, should be levied on the young men who did not pay in any other way. It is nonsense to think that the Legislature will ever give the City Council liberty to tax as they please.

those who sent children to school, as in Halifax and other cities. Surely parents would not begrudge a dollar a term for each child receiving instruction in the City Schools. Then there are men who come here with lots of flour, cargoes of coal, etc., and sell them, take the money away in their pockets, pay not a cent in rent or taxes, and walk away. These men, he thought, should be compelled to pay something for the privilege of underselling those who are residents, and as such, subject to the expenses incident to life in a city.

George R. Beer, Esq., remarked that he saw nothing in Mr. Crabbe's estimates about the cost of water for the city. He thought it would be folly to go to the Legislature with a scheme which did not cover all the ground. The water will, when furnished, necessitate the expenditure of a considerable sum in addition to that required for next year.

Councillor McLean said he would like to know the opinion of the meeting as to whether or not they were willing that the Council should levy the taxes as they saw fit, so as to spread the burden and make it as equitable as possible.

Mr. Sutherland (Davies, Sutherland & Meeks) said that to test the feeling of the meeting on this point, he would move that the City Council have leave to apply for unlimited powers of taxation. He thought taxation should embrace all classes of property; and he would oppose the imposition of tolls on persons who may come here to do business, as opposed the principles of free trade and as petty and contemptible.

He thought the amount required by the city might be made up somewhat in this way: Real estate levied upon at the rate of one per cent. would yield (say) \$26,000; poll tax of \$3 on all persons over 18 or 21 years of age, \$4,500; a half per cent. on rental would yield \$11,000 more; personal property might be taxed to the extent of \$10,000; and an income tax might be levied for the amount of (say) \$4,000; or, in all, \$55,000 a year. He would have all taxes collected by the City Council and by the same collector.

Hon. D. Davies would not agree to a tax on furniture because it is unproductive property. James Curtis, Esq., thought it a harsh and unfair proceeding to levy a poll tax upon an old man like himself—one who paid on real estate, too. The poll tax, he thought, should be levied on the young men who did not pay in any other way. It is nonsense to think that the Legislature will ever give the City Council liberty to tax as they please.

M. P. Hogan, Esq., could not understand why there is such a prejudice against a personal property tax—which is levied in every other city he has visited, and is to his mind just as legitimate an object of taxation as real estate. He would levy 1 per cent. on real estate, and 1/2 per cent. on personal property.

F. T. Newbery, Esq., seconded the motion of Mr. Sutherland. He did so for the purpose of having the sense of the meeting tested. This is such a vexed question that he thought it quite impossible for a meeting of this size; and perhaps a suitable scheme of taxation; and he would be well to let the City Council make a levy according to their best judgment, and if they do wrong let the citizens turn them out at the first opportunity.

For his part, he thought that some of the pressure should be taken off real estate; and that the young men might well bear a portion of the burden of city taxation. In St. John, young men used to pay \$5 each, a year. He thought also, that something might be done in the way of retrenchment. For instance; the assessors go round every year, would not once in every two or three years be sufficient for all practical purposes?

Rob Angus, Esq., said that what the city wanted was a mode of taxation which would realize the amount required, and a means of levying and collecting that would be equitable and efficient. It seemed to him that the system adopted in Ontario would answer our requirements better than what we now have.

Their system is that the assessors make valuations every year in the following manner:—They go from house to house. They value (say) Mr. A's real estate at (say) \$1500; personal property (say) \$500; income (say) \$700—assess all over \$400 would be \$300—each dog, \$1; bitch, \$2; (and they see that the tax is collected, by making the owner attach to each dog a brass plate, with the number of license stamped upon it—any dog found without this license is taken in charge by police, and if not claimed within a certain time is killed); horse and carriage, \$3. They leave with each housekeeper a copy of the assessment, with a notice that if he thinks there is anything wrong or unjust he must notify the city clerk within fourteen days that he means to appeal.

If he does so, the case is tried before a committee of the City Council appointed for the purpose. If he does not give notice, the assessment stands as it is. Then when they know what the valuation of the property is they strike the rate, and that rate is the same on all classes of property, whether real estate personal, or income. Then as to the means of collection after the rate and amounts are fixed, a notice is served on each taxpayer, informing him what he has to pay, and also notifying him that he will get 2 1/2 per cent. off the bill, and if he does not, proceedings will be taken to recover it. Almost all the taxes are paid within the time, as the proceedings for collection, which are as follows, are very summary: You get notice through the papers that all taxes not paid within a certain time, (which, say 10 days) it will be collected by law, and that process is very simple and efficient. The collector calls and makes a schedule of goods, enough to pay the tax, and puts the notice upon your door to the effect that if not paid within eight days, the goods will be sold to satisfy the claim. The argument that householders should pay part of the school tax because they get the use of the schools just holds as good about the other expenses of our city, as every citizen gets the protection of the fire department, the police, etc.; he also uses our streets and plank walks.

The Ontario system collects all taxes from the householder, not the landlord, and makes the personal property pay, not the land, unless there be no personal property on the land, in which case after taxes are in arrears three years, the land can be sold, or enough to satisfy the claim. The tenant does not go into a house till he finds out if there are arrears of taxes, and if his arrangement is that the landlord has to pay taxes he keeps it out of his rent unless she does. This system seems more equitable as

those who sent children to school, as in Halifax and other cities. Surely parents would not begrudge a dollar a term for each child receiving instruction in the City Schools. Then there are men who come here with lots of flour, cargoes of coal, etc., and sell them, take the money away in their pockets, pay not a cent in rent or taxes, and walk away. These men, he thought, should be compelled to pay something for the privilege of underselling those who are residents, and as such, subject to the expenses incident to life in a city.

George R. Beer, Esq., remarked that he saw nothing in Mr. Crabbe's estimates about the cost of water for the city. He thought it would be folly to go to the Legislature with a scheme which did not cover all the ground. The water will, when furnished, necessitate the expenditure of a considerable sum in addition to that required for next year.

Councillor McLean said he would like to know the opinion of the meeting as to whether or not they were willing that the Council should levy the taxes as they saw fit, so as to spread the burden and make it as equitable as possible.

Mr. Sutherland (Davies, Sutherland & Meeks) said that to test the feeling of the meeting on this point, he would move that the City Council have leave to apply for unlimited powers of taxation. He thought taxation should embrace all classes of property; and he would oppose the imposition of tolls on persons who may come here to do business, as opposed the principles of free trade and as petty and contemptible.

He thought the amount required by the city might be made up somewhat in this way: Real estate levied upon at the rate of one per cent. would yield (say) \$26,000; poll tax of \$3 on all persons over 18 or 21 years of age, \$4,500; a half per cent. on rental would yield \$11,000 more; personal property might be taxed to the extent of \$10,000; and an income tax might be levied for the amount of (say) \$4,000; or, in all, \$55,000 a year. He would have all taxes collected by the City Council and by the same collector.

Hon. D. Davies would not agree to a tax on furniture because it is unproductive property. James Curtis, Esq., thought it a harsh and unfair proceeding to levy a poll tax upon an old man like himself—one who paid on real estate, too. The poll tax, he thought, should be levied on the young men who did not pay in any other way. It is nonsense to think that the Legislature will ever give the City Council liberty to tax as they please.

and the Head must be united to the Body. Without him, the body cannot formulate a mass of faith. When he therefore speaks, as we say, *ex cathedra*, i. e., when in his capacity of universal teacher, he addresses himself to the whole world on matters touching faith or morals, by virtue of the Divine assistance promised him, his utterances are to be received as infallible. Thus his sanction raises the dignity of Councils to the dignity of irrefragable Councils. But what about the non-placets? Do they only "submit when overcome by point of numbers," as "P. P." somewhat dishonestly puts it? So far from yielding to brute force, which is evidently implied in the above quotation, they yield rather and bow in humble submission to the teaching authority of the Church, "Feed my sheep."

Christ promised to His church Unity of Faith, Unity of Worship, and Unity of Obedience, but he did not promise Unity in Politics. Why, then, unless it be to bolster up a weak cause, does he refer me to the civil questions that may agitate Catholic minds in Quebec or elsewhere, as if such differences of opinion, or purely legitimate questions of opinion, could militate against the Unity of the Roman Church?

I fear I am wearying your readers, for really so far I have encountered nothing worthy serious consideration. A few more moves and I shall leave my critic checked.

"P. P." makes "Luther's error" consist "in proclaiming the very same great doctrine of justification by faith alone which the Apostle St. Paul had so carefully taught to the early Church of Rome."

Thus he introduces the fundamental point of difference between the Catholic Church, on the one hand; and all the other denominations professing christianity, on the other.

I am well aware that the great Doctor of the Gentiles (Rom. iii. 28—xi. 6—Eph. ii. 8, 9) speaks of justifying faith without works, still we know full well that he means to refer to those works which were performed by command of the law of Moses, and which, as they were eternal, and without time, were of no avail; he did not refer to those works which are performed in a state of grace, with a lively, love inspired faith. Therefore the Apostle tells the Galatians that "faith only availed which worketh by charity" (Gal. v. 6.) and he likewise exhorts the Colossians to be fruitful in every good work, (Col. i. 10.) I could adduce other texts to the point, but the foregoing will suffice. Thus we see that although faith is necessary, it is not sufficient for salvation unless it is perfected by charity. Some have eyes, but do not see.

"P. P." exultingly flaunts in the eyes of the world the power and prosperity that have become the inheritance of those professing "Luther's error." So a new mark must now be added to the old ones, to designate the Church of Christ! Indeed the old ones may be safely dropped, and to enquiring minds kind friends will unhesitatingly point out to the Church of the All Mighty Dollar as the Church of Christ. But I read some where, years ago, that the Saviour promised that His gospel would be preached to the poor. He elsewhere assures us that His Kingdom is not of this world, and in yet another place He tells us that some receive their reward even in this life. In view of these statements, I cannot conscientiously compliment "P. P." on his brilliant discovery. Anyhow, there's no knowing where the money may eventually go in the "whirlwind" of time.

His reference to the comparative freedom of the Roman Church in the British Empire is equally unfortunate with his other random shings. Let me state that if the Roman Church does enjoy this comparative freedom, it is due to the recognition of her rights, and not to the application of Protestant principles, as "P. P." would have us infer. During the reign of Henry VIII, and his immediate successors, the Church was not so very free, to our loss be it told. "All power is from God," so says St. Paul, civil as well as ecclesiastical. God delegates the exercise of these powers to his agents on earth. Having the same immutable source, they may never clash. They are consequently in their very origin, intended to harmonize. They are not antagonistic to one another. Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's. To claim freedom for the Church in the British Empire or elsewhere, is only to claim that in so far as that freedom is guaranteed, by just so much is the Sovereign, as depository of God's temporal power, true to his trust.

With perfect propriety have we witnessed the Catholic Hierarchy appealing to the British Crown for the protection of their vested rights in the Propaganda. The Washington Government averted from its Catholic citizens a like application. They simply a matter of civil rights. They did not appeal as Catholics, but rather as British subjects, demanding protection of their imperilled rights in the dominions of a "Most Catholic King" who had prevaricated.

Thus I have replied to all "P. P.'s" structures. I leave a discriminating public to decide whether or no, I have done so satisfactorily. I was necessarily forced by reason of the vast amount of matter objected to, to barely touch important points, which, on their merits, would require a more complete exposition. However, I think I have said enough to vindicate Catholic belief in the points attacked; and I will here observe that I consider "P. P.'s" interference on a par with that of any reporter who might wish to enter any church on a Sunday, and drag the preacher into the public press, because the views enunciated did not agree with his own. My surroundings guaranteed me a certain amount of immunity and exclusiveness. Had I spoken in the Market Hall, "P. P.'s" interference might not be considered so unwarrantable. I was long in doubt whether I could, with propriety, reply to his charges. I decided eventually to do so, lest a certain portion of the public might consider that I had been completely silenced under his scathing denunciation. And now I have done. I take my leave of P. P. as I have no desire to enter the lists as a controversialist, and to continue this discussion further would lead us both into a controversy which some few might follow through curiosity, but few will see fit to profit.

Apologizing to you, Sir, for having occupied so much of your valuable space,

I remain,

GREGORY McDONALD.

St. Margaret's, King's Co., Feb. 26, '85.

DEED.

On the 31st Jan. at Dresden, Saxony, aged 19, after a short illness, Catherine Edith Bradford Griffith, youngest and beloved daughter of William Bradford Griffith, Esq., C. M. G., Lieut. Gov. of the Gold Coast Colony, and grand-daughter of Mrs. Griffith, of 29, Westbourne Park Road, Bayswater.

Lieutenant Governor Griffith is uncle-in-law to W. J. P. Parks, Esq., of Head of Hillborough, in this Island.

Molasses, Sugar, Kerosene Oil, Apples, &c.

BY Auction, Wednesday, March 4th, at 11 o'clock, at my Auction Room: