

his defeat, and, what is more, endeavours to raise a No-Popery cry, and excite public indignation against me.

Mr Barton gives an account of some interviews I had the honor of holding with him, and of some conversations that took place at these interviews. I have no wish to impugn Mr Barton's veracity; but I am bound to say that his memory has failed him in reference to these.

The following is my account of them: I asked Mr Barton to present the petition of the Dunedin Catholics to the Provincial Council. He did not positively refuse, but he made very great difficulties about doing so, and suggested to me the propriety of asking the member for the Lakes District to present this petition. I replied: "That hon. member is not our representative; he represents a mixed constituency, just as you do; and, as you are one of the members for Dunedin, the Catholics of Dunedin have a claim on you." Ultimately Mr Barton consented to present the petition. The following day, I think, I sent down the petition, together with a note to Mr Barton, and both were left on his desk in the Council Hall. During the three following days Catholic petitions were presented from various places in the province but neither Mr Barton nor anyone on his behalf, presented the petition of the Dunedin Catholics. On finding such to be the case, I sent a gentleman to look after the matter, and ask some other member to present our petition. On making inquiry this gentleman ascertained that both the petition and my letter had been kicked about the Council Hall for three days; and he also ascertained that so great was the disinclination to do us the poor courtesy of even permitting us to petition the Council for redress of a grievance, that another representative of Dunedin, when asked to present the petition, indignantly refused to do so.

Some time after this, the member for the Lakes District alluded to above resigned his seat in the House of Representatives; and Mr Barton, who was a candidate for the vacant seat, came to my house, and asked me to give him my interest in the district, and use my influence with the Catholic electors there in his favor. I replied that I would not interfere in politics. Mr Barton pressed his suit, adding that if I would exert my influence for him he was pretty certain of being returned, as he had many friends there who would support him. I replied a second time that I would not interfere in politics. But Mr Barton was not to be put off so easily. He continued to press me to interfere on his behalf, and at last, in order to get rid of the importunity, I said: "Well, Mr Barton, as you press me to interfere, I certainly shall do so if you stand; and in that case I shall ask such as I have influence with to vote against you." "Why?" he asked. "Because," I replied, "you disoblged us in reference to our petition." Mr Barton then pleaded the Reicholt case as his excuse. "But," I rejoined, "you were in the House during these three days, and if you wished you might have complied with the request of your constituents, or at all events you could have asked some other member to have presented the petition on your behalf." Then Mr Barton said: "Do you want me to spoil myself? If I go in for you, the others will go against me." I answered: "I do not ask you to become our advocate, but we have a claim on you and on every man for justice." Mr Barton answered: "But I am your friend. I have Catholic friends; and you are not able to put into Parliament one of your own." My answer was emphatic: "Well, Mr Barton, if you are our friend, you have a comical way of showing friendship, and, though we are not strong enough to put in one of our own, we are strong enough to keep you out." And I meant what I said. Mr Barton then said, "Well then I won't stand." After which he went away.

I wish you, sir, and the public to make no mistake as to Mr Barton's conduct. He asked me a couple of years ago to use my influence with the Catholic electors of the Lakes District to induce them to vote for him, and in his letter, published in your issue of to-day, he manifestly endeavours to hold me up to his Protestant fellow-colonists as a man who is endeavouring to do all sorts of political evil, because he wishes, without any grounds other than those stated above, to attribute his defeat to me. Certainly the man who asked me to help to return him for the Lakes District is the last man in the world who should find fault with me for helping to defeat him the other day, even if I had done any overt act to that end.

Mr Barton's letter will have one good effect: it will open the eyes of the few Catholics, whom he had up to the present succeeded in deceiving; and I do hope that my Protestant fellow-colonists will not permit themselves to be made tools of by the quondam balabant Liberal, now turned Orangeman. The most besotted bigot could not have given expression to a greater spirit of hostility to his Catholic fellow-subjects, and a more lamentable ignorance in reference to the designs of the Catholic Church, than Mr Barton has displayed in his letter of to-day.

Mr Barton is angry at the idea of Catholics voting in a body in order to enforce their principles. What crime is there in their doing so? All electors of all denominations do this; and were they to do anything else, what would be said of them? People ought to vote according to their consciences. But Mr Barton seems to think that Catholics should vote for their enemies, and that consequently it was a crime in them not to vote for himself. My idea, however, is that, had they supported him in the late election, they would have proved themselves slaves, and given strong reasons for concluding that they are deserving of being slaves.—I am, &c., † E. MORAN.

The New York Catholic Foundling Asylum has rescued 5000 infants from an unnatural death, and has enabled 5000 women to rise from misery and degradation worse than death; and although all this has been done in a very few years, the State of New York, to its shame, refuses to aid in the meritorious work, for no other reason than that the conductors of the asylum are Catholics.

Monsignor Capel will not, it is stated, be able to lead the intended pilgrimage of English Catholics to the Holy Land, which was announced for the coming summer. The reason why he is obliged to abandon the design is the press of business thrown upon him in connection with the newly-projected English Catholic University.

## CONSECRATION OF THE CHURCH OF "ST. MARY OF THE ANGELS," WELLINGTON.

THE ceremony of consecrating, or, more correctly speaking, "blessing" the new Roman Catholic Church, Te Aro, took place in presence of a congregation numbering between 400 and 500 persons. very many of whom, not being members of the Church, were attracted by the nature of the ceremony, while others attended as a mark of respect to the venerable Father O'Reilly, whose charitable actions and Christian life are, perhaps, as well known to the whole community as they are to the particular denomination to which he belongs. The ceremony throughout was very solemn and impressive, so much so that the general effect produced by the grand cathedral music, the chaste character of the decorations surrounding the altar, the rich robes of the officiating priests, and their fervid chants and intonations, was perceptible in its influences as well upon the faithful adherent, whose constant attendance it would be supposed would render such scenes familiar, as upon persons to whom they were strange and consequently more striking. The ceremony was commenced at half-past ten by the Rev. Father O'Reilly, who, preceded by the cross-bearer, thurifer, and acolytes, and assisted by the Rev. Father Cummins, as Deacon, and the Rev. Father Goutenoire, as Sub-Deacon, advanced to the porch of the Church, where the prayers usual upon such occasions were said. The procession then moved along slowly, and prayers and aspersions were said outside and inside the Church, as prescribed by the Roman Ritual; the Litany of the Saints was chanted, and the blessing given. On reaching the altar the hymn "Veni Creator Spiritus" was intoned by the priests and taken up by a member of the choir, in a full melodious voice. At the conclusion of the hymn the priests retired to the Sanctuary to prepare for the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice, and upon their return to the altar, attired in vestments of gold, High Mass commenced. After singing the Gospel, the Rev. Father Cummins, who intimated that he had been confined to his bed during the past week, preached a sermon appropriate to the occasion, taking for his text the words of the 56th chap. of Isaiah, "Adducam eos in montem sanctum meum et edificabo eos in domo drationis meae," the meaning of these words being applied to the Church in which the congregation were assembled. Father Cummins proceeded to explain the object for which they were gathered together, beginning with the interrogatory, "Why should they erect a temple to God, all the Universe being His temple." "Go where you may, says the great Apostle, God is near, we live and move in Him. . . . Nevertheless men have at all time consecrated to Him places which He deigned to honor with a special presence. The Patriarchs dedicated to Him those places where He had manifested Himself. The Israelites in the desert regarded the tabernacle as the seat of His glory; and arrived in Jerusalem, they no longer invoked Him with the solemnity of incense and victims, save in that august temple raised to Him by Solomon. This was then the holy place of the universe; there, gifts and sacrifices were offered, and thither the Israelites directed their daily course unceasing. When exiles, captive in a stranger land, they turned towards it their thoughts and poured forth their aspirations, centre of their hope, place of their regard; their joy, their regret, the object of their prayers. Daniel exposed himself to the lions rather than forget this duty, and often Jerusalem saw with pleasure the crowned head of the infidel impressed with awe therein, and bowing there before the God of armies. But now if we raise a temple, wherefore an altar? Why another victim? Sacrifice my brethren is essential to true religion, and no true religion can exist without it. Ask me where is the House of God! where was, and where is His Church for ever? I will answer—there; where was and where is the altar. From the dawn of creation altars were raised whereon to offer sacrifices; and the people of God always held sacred the places where such altars were erected. Abel, Noah, Abraham, and other Patriarchs assembled their families around them to offer up their prayers and sacrifices. Abraham planted a grove about his altar. Jacob raised an altar, anointed it with oil, and called it the dwelling of God. When God made known to the Jews the manner in which He wished to be honored, He gave them laws, rites, and a complete set of ceremonies. He commanded two altars, an altar of gold for His incense, another not inferior for holocausts. He wished all things consecrated to Him, anointed with oil as consecration, and when later on His temple was the word of His will, what respect and magnificence haloed forth the execution. Then consult St. Paul—review the Acts. Consult the Doctors, the Saints, the first Martyrs. Has it not been the same from the cradle of the Christian Church as the ages of peace or persecution permitted it.

But an altar is indicative of sacrifices; and I say no sacrifice, no religion. It is its charm, its very key, its foundation. The sacrifices of the old law were but figures of the new; and the new has fulfilled all the figures of the old. Here the Rev. Father gave a definition of sacrifice, and he went on to prove that now, as at all times, a true sacrifice is offered in the true Church, and that sacrifice is the Mass—so-called from the Latin word *Missa*. It was proved by the Sacred writer and Prophet, when saying "Thou art a Priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedech." A priest's duty was to offer sacrifice. Christ must offer sacrifice according to the ritual of His order, and Melchisedech offered bread and wine because he was high priest—and his was the figure—Christ in the same order, gave the reality. Priest for ever must offer sacrifice for ever—this he does by his priest; and this is the only action they perform in the person of Christ, and speaking in His very name. Malachi (chap. 1) foretold a new sacrifice—the old were to be rejected, a new one supplied—and that new one would be a pure oblation, offered in every place, and from the rising to the setting sun. The sacrifice of the Cross was offered only once, in a bloody manner, and in one place. Sacrifice of prayers and works, when pure, were never rejected—the Mass is then the true sacrifice. Jesus, (Matt. xxvi. 26.) at the Last Supper took bread and blessed &c., and said take this and eat, this is my body: and taking the chalice He said, take this and drink, this is my blood. Now it is not wine that is shed for the remission of sin—alas! how many sins wine has occasioned;—but the same voice and power that spoke and creation answered, the same Word that said and it was done, the power that