

Salut Magdalene.
 Life's choicest blessings would I freely give,
 Fair Magdalene, fair Magdalene,
 If so thy gift of tears I might receive
 And weep alone, of that unwept.

For to the feet of Him who spoke to thee
 Sweet words that can to us give hope,
 Through blinding tears alone my way I see
 From out the darkness where I grope.

O tears that spring from Hope's eternal fount,
 And from the bruised heart of love!
 These pearls do silver o'er the souls that mount
 On wings of light to God above.

If sorrow in that best abode could be
 There like to thine, sweet Magdalene,
 For in thy grief is such divinity
 As pain doth pleasure make, I ween.

Through sweet salt tears and those full eyes
 Of thine,
 That upward look with burning love,
 As white as lilies washed with dew doth shine
 A soul that will no more will rove.

Not purer, fairer on thy mother's breast
 Did thy young face in sleep repose
 Than, at the feet of thy dear Lord, at rest,
 While all thy heart in love o'erflows.

Oh! that thy grief were mine, as mine thy
 Love,
 That love might lead me to the feast
 Where Jesus is, and I might enter in
 And of my burden be released.

O Salut! that sinners wait, pray thou for me,
 Who walk in darkness and in wo,
 Who, bound in heavy chains, but would be
 Free,
 If where my Saviour is thou'lt show.

Into the desert then alone I'll go,
 Nor miss the words that I do have;
 And my sweet tears shall never cease to flow,
 And I shall never cease to grieve.
 —Catholic World.

THE CHURCH.

Its Influence upon Civilization.

It was with no small degree of pleasure we announced last week that a series of Sunday evening lectures would be given at the old Cathedral, on Jefferson avenue, during the coming fall and winter. These Sunday evening lectures proved quite popular at this church last year and were listened to with pleasure and profit by crowded audiences.

It is to be hoped that the attendance will be fully as large this year, and, indeed, judging from the number of those who were present at the church last Sunday evening, when the opening lecture of the course was delivered by Fr. Walsh, S. J., the lectures will be as popular as ever.

The Rev. Father announced the subject of the lectures to be "The Church and Civilization," and then proceeded to say that during the evening lectures in the past we have studied all that relates to the Church of Christ as regards its authenticity and from certain distinguishing features which necessarily belong to it, we saw which of all existing churches must be the true Church, the Church founded by Christ.

The Church of Christ must be one, holy, Catholic and apostolic, and the Church of Rome being the only one in which these four marks are to be found, she must be the bride of Christ. We have never as yet, however, seen in particular what the Church has done for mankind, even in a social point of view, what a benefactress she has been to the world, and why she has been so highly honored upon man the Church that God bestowed upon her, has been a study of what she has accomplished in the social order is one of the most interesting of studies. She is no mere theorizer who plans but never executes. She shows her love for those in whom she interests herself, not by empty suggestions but by deeds. Her work as we shall see is written on every page of the world's history, since her foundation. The monuments that on every side testify to that work show how much we should glorify God for having given us in her so mighty an instrument for all that most vitally concerns us.

Let the world talk of its philanthropists; let it raise monuments to its heroes; that is all right, so long as true worth is honored. It would be unfortunate were it otherwise. For the honor of national gratitude this country should never forget Washington; his well known figure should grace every city in the land; he did for his country what few patriots have accomplished, and so long as distinguished patriotism bears recognition, so long as fortitude in bearing up under difficulties of every kind merits reward, let us hope that marble and bronze will tell of Yorktown and the defeat of the millions of that power that would crush national aspirations to gratify lust for conquest.

Ireland was lately in carnival and justly so by reason of him whose well known massive form was unveiled in her capital's greatest thoroughfare. Well was the recognition merited; well might the hundreds of thousands that stood before his statue honor the man who found their country a nation of slaves, and left it a nation of free men. He who cast off the chains their fathers wore for centuries deserves a remembrance from posterity.

It is all right, then, to honor worth, but whilst the other friends of humanity are honored its greatest benefactor should not be forgotten, and a study of what the Church has done for the world will show us how much is done for her, and a study of her influence on civilization will be most interesting.

To understand fully and judge at its proper value what the Church has done for civilization we must know in what condition the world was upon the Church's first entering it. The more squalid she was in degradation the more thanks are due to the Church for having raised her out of her degraded state, and the lower the moral feeling of humanity had sunk the greater the admiration her regeneration must excite within us.

In what condition then, asked the lecturer, did the Church find the world? This is a point we should well fix in our minds; for, knowing it, the blessings resulting to individuals in particular and to society in general will be all the more apparent. A very dark picture society then presented. It was fair to external appearance, but within it was corrupt to the very core. The great Roman empire had just then reached the zenith of her glory; Rome was mistress of the world, her supremacy was undisputed, her sway was universally acknowledged, her appearance dazzled the world, literally bewildered it. Pageants such as people

had never before seen passed through her streets, the treasures of the world were there displayed, the presence of men from every nation under Heaven testified to the extent of the mighty empire. The magnificence of her palaces, the costly garments of her sons and daughters, the crowded attendants that followed in their footsteps presented a scene that could be witnessed only in Rome under Augustus, and produced such an effect upon beholders as to make them exclaim in wonder, "Rome! you are mistress of the world! Happy is the world in having such a mistress."

But beneath all this outward glitter there was corruption within, there was a moral depravity that preyed upon the vitals of humanity, that was undermining society. Morality existed only in name, men that praised it by word outraged it by act. The secret moralists had no difficulty in assisting at the prostitutions of what men called the Floral games, the most infamous of infamous pastimes. The scenes of degradation that took place at the villas of the Romans baffle description, a Christian audience would listen to them with loathsome disgust. Respect for ordinary decency prevents a repetition of the vivid descriptions of Tacitus. The slaves that cultivated the earth and that by the sweat of their brows ministered to Roman luxury, were kept constantly chained, their food was hardly sufficient to sustain life, the merest pittance of bread and water was their repast. At night their beds were in subterranean dungeons from which light and air were excluded.

As Rome had to be amused, the African lions that might appear in the amphitheatres were by law protected; unfortunate slaves might be destroyed by hundreds, but woe to the poor peasant who killed the beast that would destroy him. When an unfortunate victim perished in the circus, torn to pieces by a savage panther, or galled by the horns of a stag, persons afflicted with certain diseases would rush in to bathe themselves in his blood. The beasts that went to appear in the games of the circus were fed on human flesh.

To celebrate the birthday of a certain individual on one occasion, three thousand Jews were given up to be torn to pieces by wild beasts in the amphitheater. During the reign of the Emperor Claudius, nineteen thousand men slaughtered each other, not far from Rome, for the amusement of the Romans. No wonder amidst such degeneracy suicide was a common crime. The extinction of moral feelings generates an indifference to death, and hence the frequency of self destruction amongst a people whose morals are corrupt. For man by gratifying his passions becomes like the beast of the field, and quits life with the same unconscious with which they leave it.

Infanticide, continued the speaker, was a recognized institution of Rome, sanctioned as it was by its laws. We may imagine our times bad enough, and Heaven knows they are bad enough, but it can be said without fear of contradiction, that the most corrupt nation of modern times was a nation of ages when compared to the people that lived when Christ became man. The world will never again in all likelihood, witness the orgies of the villas of Rome's nobles; will never again become drunk with human blood shed in an amphitheater.

Of all the degradations of paganism, the gladiatorial combat seems to have been the worst. Men were then found to shed each other's blood for pay, to shed the blood of their friends in deadly combat. The sword driven to the hilt through the body of perhaps a dear friend was gazed over, was hailed with rapturous applause by the spectators. The sight of human blood seemed to have a maddening effect upon the people. Men and women became wild in their expressions of delight. A kind of delirium took possession of them, such charms had the shedding of blood for this deluded people. Thus, whilst outwardly society presented a brilliant appearance, veiled as it was by a brilliant garb of ostentation and opulence, within it was all corruption—its boasted morality was a sham.

How could society last in such a state! Must not its dissolution have come sooner or later? Must not barbarism have been the consequence of such unrestrained degeneracy?

To understand what must have become of society with such corruption existing in its midst, we have to draw our own conclusions from what would at present be the consequence if immorally were practiced, if games were tolerated, if human filial decency was a pastime, if men and women calling themselves civilized were found to applaud the brutalities of the arena. The immoral theater is now closed by law, the violators of the law of decency are punished. If those things were not condemned, but sanctioned, schools would exist in which vice would be taught, corruption would ensue, society could not stand the strain. Its dissolution would necessarily follow.—Western Home Journal.

Finish the Soup First.

Hotel life in Ireland is sometimes made comical to strangers by the grotesqueness of waiters just fresh from rural life. It appears that a Dublin hotel-keeper told such a newly-imported "server" that he must always serve everyone with soup at dinner, and be quite certain that he had it. Thereupon ensued the following scene between a tourist and a new waiter, Barney. "Soup, sir?" said Barney. "No soup for me," said the gentleman. "But you must have it," said Barney; "it is the rule of the house." "Hang the house!" exclaimed the guest, high in exasperation. "When I don't want soup, I won't eat it. Get along with you!" "Well," said Barney with solemnity, "all I can say is just this—it's the regulation of the house, and a soup a drop else ye'll get till ye finish the soup!"

It Has Entered the Capitol Buildings.

It has finally gained its point and no less a personage than the Sergeant-at-Arms of the House of Commons, Mr. P. W. McDonnell, Ottawa, thus indorses the Great German Remedy. "St. Jacobs Oil" is a splendid remedy. I used it on my left hand and wrist for rheumatism, and found it all that it is claimed to be. Mrs. McDonnell used it for a most severely sprained ankle; by the steady use of the article for a few days a complete cure was effected. St. Jacobs Oil does its work very satisfactorily and also rapidly; such at least is my opinion.

Most Extraordinary are the Cures.

Most extraordinary are the cures which rack the muscles and joints by the rheumatic. Northrop & Lyman's Vegetable Discovery and Dyspeptic Cure, by promoting increased action of the kidneys, by which the blood is more effectively de-purated removes through the natural channels certain acid elements in the circulation which produce rheumatism and other ailments. It is also a fine laxative anti-bilious medicine and general corrector. Sold by Harkness and Co., Druggists, Dundas St.

ROUCH ON RATS.

"ROUCH ON RATS," clears out rats, mice, flies, roaches, bed-bugs, ants, vermin, chipmunks. 15c.

IRISH CRIME.

Dublin Freeman's Journal.

These pretensions, one-eyed, partisan statisticians, who by their perpetual quotations of "Irish crime" seem to intend to preach that crime exists nowhere else, will do well to study Professor Leone Levi's address to the British Association. The statisticians who listened to the paper thought it of such value that they ordered it to be printed in extenso amongst the Transactions of the Association, and no one who reads our yesterday's report of the address will question the wisdom of the resolution adopted by the meeting. For a couple of years past there have been in Parliament and in the English press weekly, monthly, quarterly, and annual returns of crime in this country, and by this as well as by other means the public mind has become impregnated with the strange delusion that we are the most crime-loving and crime committing people in the world. No greater misconception ever prevailed, and no more wicked calumny on a race was ever circulated. That numerous and grievous outrages saddening the hearts of all patriots have been committed in Ireland, we do not at all deny. How could we deny it? We who have never ceased to bewail the violence, and who have persistently used our dearest efforts and influence to suppress them. This candid and sorrowing admission of facts is, however, quite a different thing from the gloating and padded enumeration that takes pleasure in the record malignantly perverts it, into a lathsome and exclusive speciality. We have often and often, in self defence against this monstrous imputation, been compelled to point out that our people, with all their faults, have no such bad preeminence in wickedness, that they have no innate love of evil, and absolutely and comparatively there is far less crime, as well as fewer types of crime, with us than with the other peoples of the United Kingdom. This is the great national truth which that able and accomplished economist, Mr. Levi, impressed by figures, and facts, and computations on the Southampton savants, and it was for inculating this that the Association thanked him. Professor Levi was discussing facts in the interest of civilization and the spread of science, and for his facts he appealed to the annual volumes of judicial statistics for England and Wales, Scotland, and Ireland respectively. Not one of these returns is complete for the purpose of the economist but notwithstanding their defective method of compilation, they abundantly exhibit the relative criminality of English, Scotch, and Irish peoples. "According to the statistics issued," says Mr. Levi, "the number of indictable offences within the last ten years in England, Wales, and Ireland indicated a slight increase of crime. In recent years, both absolutely and relatively to population, it would be seen that the number of crimes reported to the magistracy in Ireland was uniformly smaller in England and Wales. Balancing the returns of the ten years from 1871 to 1880 inclusive, he finds that the average of the two periods of five years had been per 1,000—England and Wales, from 1875, 1.98; Ireland, 1.36. From 1876 to 1880—England and Wales, 2.09; Ireland, 1.57. He finds that in Scotland and Ireland the proportion of convictions was uniformly greater than in England and Wales, while the proportion of convictions was greatest in England and Wales and least in Ireland. Mr. Leone Levi notices that the want of evidence to sustain the Irish convictions goes far towards accounting for the inversion of these two proportions. He subjects the statistics in Ireland to the comparison—there is much point in the comparison—of cases of offences against property offences against the person. In England in 1880, 72 persons were apprehended for murder. Of these 43 were discharged for want of evidence or want of prosecution, or 18 per cent. of the whole, and 29 committed for trial, or 39 per cent. In Ireland in the same year 37 persons were apprehended for murder; 33 of the whole, were discharged for want of evidence, and 16, or only 30 per cent. committed for trial. In England 28, or 46 per cent. were convicted. Of 35 committed for murder in Ireland only 3, or 8 per cent. were convicted. Calculative crime on the basis of population, Mr. Levi gives the following figures—In proportion to the population the offences against property were 5.13 in England, 3.04 in Scotland, against 1.16 in England. The offences against morals were in the proportion of 0.21 to the 1,000 in England, against 0.04 in Ireland. Offences against the person 11.58 to the 1,000 in Scotland, against 2.82 in England; and the offences against property 6.67 to the 1,000 in Scotland, against 1.98 in Ireland; but in Scotland crime was worse in Ireland, being 16.90 per 1,000, 6.77 in England, and 7.26 in Scotland. He adds that "but for drunkenness and small crimes the criminal statistics are favourable to Ireland," as compared with France, the state of crime in the United Kingdom gave unsatisfactory results, in France the proportion being 17.18 per 1,000, as against 20.62 per 1,000 in the United Kingdom.

BISHOP KEENE ON INTEMPERANCE.

The following able letter was written on behalf of total abstinence to Rev. J. B. Cotter, President of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union of America. RICHMOND, Va., July 5th, 1882.

Since I cannot have the happiness of being present at the convention, I will comply with your request that I should "state my views on the subject of Catholic total abstinence."

Personally, I trust that my views on the subject are well known to the Union. For two years before the Union was organized I was doing my best in the cause of Catholic total abstinence. When the Union began, I had the honor of being one of those who laid its foundation. And the year that have passed since then have only deepened my conviction that the cause of Catholic total abstinence is one of the noblest, one of the most truly Catholic, one of the most necessary to our generation, in which the energies of any Christian or any minister of God can be enlisted. And the weightier and the wider my responsibility for souls has become the more have I felt myself constrained not only by charity but by bounden duty, to persevere in and to redouble my efforts for the dissemination of Catholic total abstinence.

The Church of Christ can never ally herself with Manicheism or fanaticism, by teaching that intoxicating drinks are evil in themselves, or that whoever uses them in any way is guilty of sin. But neither can she ever omit her sacred duty of teaching and proclaiming that even the best things must be given up by them to whom it becomes a proximate occasion of mortal sin and that one is bound to lay aside even what is harmless in itself, if the use of it be a scandal to his weaker brethren. On these two undeniable principles stands the cause of Catholic total abstinence.

Sad and bitter experience has but too well proved the following points:

First.—The drinks most in vogue amongst our people, and the drinking customs prevalent amongst them, have a natural tendency to lead to excess, to intoxication, and to frequent, even habitual drunkenness. In the walk of cases, nothing but the strongest resolution, and the most careful precautions can guard against these results. That it would be rash to count upon the use of these safeguards by people in general, is proved by the hundreds of thousands of drunkards in every generation.

Second.—To the bulk of those who have contracted the habit of drunkenness, or who are drifting towards it, the further use of intoxicating drinks is a proximate occasion of mortal sin; and therefore they are bound to give it up. It is generally admitted that whoever has fallen into the awful habit cannot trust himself to take a glass of liquor, and that if any one contracts the habit taking hold of him, his only salvation is to stop. Cardinal Manning uttered the verdict of universal experience when he declared his conviction that the only efficient remedy for drunkenness is total abstinence.

Third.—Intoxication is a painful source of innumerable other grievous sins. The prelates of the United States, assembled in Second Plenary Council, solemnly declared that from drunkenness proceed the worst scandals which the church has to deplore. Hence that which is the proximate occasion of intoxication is, in most cases, the proximate occasion of many other grave sins besides; and this increases exceedingly the grievousness of the evil and the obligation of shunning it. Hence the shocking consequences to individuals, to families, and to public trusts in high and low places, which flow from this one fell vice. But these things are but too well known, and we can be spared the sad recital. It was the knowledge of these things that moved the assembled prelates to implore the pastors of souls for love of Jesus Christ, to make use of every means in their power for the extirpation of drunkenness; and hence too did they bestow special approval and blessing on all who, the better to guard against excess, pledge themselves to total abstinence.

Fourth.—When we look around and consider how wide-spread, how destructive, and how scandalous is the evil in question, and when we call to mind our duty to God, to the Church, to ourselves, and to our neighbor; then it becomes self-evident that it is every one's duty to do what God's providence makes it possible for him to do, toward arresting such an evil and removing such a scandal. And this must mainly depend, not on the efforts of drunkards, but on the efforts of good and sober men. As a bishop said to me some years ago, "The backbone of the Catholic total abstinence movement must be men who never were drunkards." How any Catholic could feel indifferent to this desolating and soul-destroying evil, I cannot understand. How any Catholic could fail to use any opportunity that God gave him to check this flood of destruction, I can still less comprehend. And the greater the influence any one may possess toward hindering the evil, the more do I wonder by what logic he can possibly excuse himself from exerting it. But that any Catholic should, in any way, help on the evil; that he could be bribed, at any price, to harness himself to this demon engine in its mad career, is to me an enigma beyond all solution. The bare mention of the case ought to create among all Catholics a hatred of the vice and everything that tends to produce or maintain it.

Fifth.—Every Christian knows that he cannot hope to keep any good resolutions without the grace of God, nor to have the grace without using the means to obtain it. Hence the earnestness with which the Plenary Council already quoted exhorts all to bear in mind that, without prayer, the sacraments, and the other means of divine grace, their own frail efforts can never produce good and lasting results. Hence too, the wisdom of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union, which aims at extirpating drunkenness, and spreading the blessings of temperance, not merely by the force resulting from organized and fraternal effort, but above all, by the incomparable power of religion; by keeping their organization and their efforts under the constant guidance and influence and blessing of the Church of Christ.

MIXED MARRIAGES IN GERMANY.

Liverpool Catholic Times.

The troubles of Catholics in Germany are not yet at an end, in spite of the progress which has this year been made towards a solution of the differences which had so unhappily arisen between the Church and the Government. Last week the news was current, that Herr Von Schaefer, Prussian Minister at the Vatican, had been invited to pay a visit to Prince Bismarck before returning to Rome; and the announcement was received with surprise, as it was well known that the ambassador had already taken final leave of the Imperial Chancellor. That some reason of special importance must exist for this second visit, was evident, and there was probably good ground for the opinion that it was to be found in the unfortunate circumstances that fresh complications have arisen between the Church and State in Prussia on the subject of the marriage laws, and that the Emperor feels strongly on the subject—being, it is needless to say, opposed to the course adopted by the Catholic clergy. The controversy, we believe, arose on the occasion of the marriage of a certain Catholic Government official to a Protestant lady. The parties had intended that the marriage ceremony should be performed both in the Catholic church and in a Protestant place of worship, but the priest of the parish informed the bridegroom, as it was his duty to do, that such an arrangement was unlawful for him. However, Prince-Bishop Herzog, at Breslau, has forbidden his clergy to celebrate any marriage of a Catholic with a Protestant when the parties had already been married by a Protestant minister, or when the performance of such a ceremony, after the celebration of the marriage in the Catholic church, was in contemplation. To everyone in this country, Protestant and Catholic alike, nothing unreasonable will be found in all this. The rules of the Church are well known, and if a Protestant intends to marry a Catholic the terms on which it can be rightly done are fully understood. For a Protestant to be married in a Catholic church is no hardship, and offers against no Protestant party, we have ever heard of. For a Catholic to be married in a Protestant place of worship and by a Protestant minister is a distinct and willful offence against the principles of his religion. To have a marriage celebrated both by a priest and by a Protestant minister is evidently absurd, even if it be nothing worse. Suppose that in the case of a mixed marriage in England the parties repair to the Protestant minister, the Catholic party is guilty of grievous sin, and cannot receive the grace of the Sacrament of Matrimony until that sin is sincerely repented of and forgiven in the Sacrament of Penance—a *valid* marriage has been contracted. It will not be necessary, and it will not be possible, for the priest, for the simple reason that they have been married already—and the marriage though improperly contracted, is still perfectly valid. In the same way it is obviously absurd—if it be nothing worse—for the parties in a mixed marriage to betake themselves to a Protestant minister and go through a marriage ceremony, if they have already been married by a priest. In the Catholic party it is not only absurd, it is something worse. What is to be said of a Catholic who, having been duly married, consents to seek for himself and his wife, as if they were still unmarried, the nuptial "blessing" of a heretic? All this is perfectly well understood in this country, and English good sense does not tolerate the idea that a marriage, once contracted, may be repeated on the same day and by the same parties. Unhappily the case is otherwise in Germany, and certain journals there have not been ashamed to make capital against the Church out of the occurrence to which we have alluded above. The pretext is flimsy enough, but it serves no doubt as well as any other, when the object is to open a quarrel which it was not too much to say when it is remembered that some journals have had the hardihood to assert that the Catholic Church considers all Protestant marriages to be invalid. This is sufficient indication of the tone of the controversy, and the knowledge displayed by the assailants of the clergy. But let that pass. When once the question of how the Church regards the Protestant marriages had been stated, the semi-official North German Gazette took upon itself the task of making further inquiries into the matter. Very soon it discovered that the decree of the Council of Trent was promulgated some years ago at Berlin. It found that a provision from the Catholic clergy was placarded at the doors of all the churches of the capital, informing the faithful that henceforth Catholic and mixed marriages not contracted in accordance with the form prescribed by the Council of Trent were null and void. Consequently such marriages, to be valid, must be concluded in the presence of the parish priest and, at

CHARLES KICKHAM'S LAST HOURS.

His final Profession of Faith and Patriotism.

The death of Mr. Charles J. Kickham was a sad and unexpected surprise. On Saturday morning he was in good health as he had been enjoying for many years. No premonitory symptom had warned him to expect any sudden or immediate change. It was about noon or shortly after that hour on the day named, he was taking his accustomed walk in the garden, when he received a "stroke" in the arm. It would appear that he immediately understood the warning and felt it was serious. In fact, he almost regarded it as the last summons. He shouted as a signal for help, but he was able to reach his own room. There he wrote a brief note, which was scarcely readable, to Dr. Sigerson, who had attended him on several occasions, and who was an intimate friend. It simply urged the doctor to come at once to his assistance, although at the time of writing the letter he did not believe that medical aid would be of the least service. For some hours after the attack Mr. Kickham was conscious; but gradually his speech began to fail, and his words were hardly understandable at nine o'clock on Saturday night. Dr. Sigerson tried every means within his great experience of nervous diseases; he was night and day at the bedside of his patient, applying every well known remedy in such cases. On Sunday it was obvious that Mr. Kickham was passing away from the world. He never rallied from the first moment that he felt the pull at his arm. He grew weaker and weaker, and was sinking so rapidly on Monday that death was hourly expected. But he lingered until Tuesday night at half past eleven o'clock, when he passed away in peace.

While Mr. Kickham was able to speak, his thoughts were almost exclusively occupied with his country. After he was unable to do so, he dictated to a clergyman the note to Dr. Sigerson, he said clearly: "Let it be known that I die in the Catholic faith; that I love Ireland; and I only wish I could do more for her."

Having been born, according to our information, in 1828, Mr. Kickham was scarcely fifty-four years of age, but looked at least sixty. His aged appearance was only the natural result of a protracted illness and of infirmities which prevented him from taking any exercise. For many years past he could only commune with the world by means of the deaf mute alphabet, and his sight being very defective, the words had to be spelled upon his own fingers.—Dublin Freeman.

The Salvation Army's Paper.

A copy of the War Cry, the official organ of the "Salvation Army," is before us. It is published in Philadelphia, and consists of four pages, costs three cents, and is full of hysterical accounts of the doings of the army. To any man whose religious faith and feelings are sacred to him this publication cannot but be a source of offence. However earnest the soldiers of the Salvation Army may be—and we believe they are earnest—good taste is assuredly not one of their characteristics, and the War Cry is calculated to excite the feelings of every man of sense. For New York Major was there. So was Jesus. Both worked hard for souls." Again, in an account of a meeting at Manchester, Conn:

"God came upon us. One soldier clutched the hair of the next comrade and off came the entire scalp in her hand, and revealed a bare head. The soldier dropped the scalp, but kept hold on God. The scalped soldier shouted glory to God; anything for Jesus. This was but a sign that God was going to remove the covering from the eyes of the people."

We need not multiply examples, but surely such language as this, though not meant irreverently, is likely to create irreverence in others.—New York Sun.

Mrs. A. Nelson, Brantford, writes: "I was a sufferer from Chronic Dyspepsia for seven years. Always after eating, an intense burning sensation in the stomach, at times very distressing, caused a drooping and languid feeling, which would last for several hours after eating. I was recommended by Mr. Poppelwell, Chemist, of my city, to try Northrop & Lyman's Vegetable Discovery and Dyspeptic Cure, and I am thankful to say that I have not been better for years; that burning sensation and languid feeling has all gone, and food does not lie heavy on my stomach. Others of my family have used it with best result." Sold by Harkness & Co., Druggists, Dundas St.

Co. Bortle, of Manchester, Ontario Co., N. Y., writes: "I obtained immediate relief from the use of Dr. Thomas' Electric Oil. I have had asthma for eleven years. Have been obliged to sit up all night for ten or twelve nights in succession. I can now sleep soundly all night on a feather bed, which I had not been able to do previously to using the Oil."

Mrs. Barnhart, cor. Pratt and Broadway, has been a sufferer for twelve years through rheumatism, and has tried every remedy she could hear of, but received no benefit, until she tried Dr. Thomas' Electric Oil; she says she cannot express the satisfaction she feels at having her pain entirely removed and her rheumatism cured.

least, two witnesses. This is the sum and substance of the matter. And on account of this the Church is being held up to the indignance of Germany as most notoriously intolerant and censorious the hatred of all true Protestants. Why so? Merely because she will not admit that marriages in which one of the parties is Catholic may be contracted before a Protestant minister quite as well as before a Catholic parish priest. Now, is there in reality anything intolerant in the declaration of the clergy of Berlin? It should be observed that it leaves Protestants and their marriages quite alone, and is concerned only with marriages in which one of the parties is a Catholic. Yet it is precisely this circumstance that renders it, according to the Protestant press, so unacceptably intolerant. When Catholics in Germany and elsewhere have greater intolerance to complain of than Protestants should make known their own tenets to their own people, a marvellous change will have passed over the face of society.

MIXED MARRIAGES IN GERMANY.

Liverpool Catholic Times.

The troubles of Catholics in Germany are not yet at an end, in spite of the progress which has this year been made towards a solution of the differences which had so unhappily arisen between the Church and the Government. Last week the news was current, that Herr Von Schaefer, Prussian Minister at the Vatican, had been invited to pay a visit to Prince Bismarck before returning to Rome; and the announcement was received with surprise, as it was well known that the ambassador had already taken final leave of the Imperial Chancellor. That some reason of special importance must exist for this second visit, was evident, and there was probably good ground for the opinion that it was to be found in the unfortunate circumstances that fresh complications have arisen between the Church and State in Prussia on the subject of the marriage laws, and that the Emperor feels strongly on the subject—being, it is needless to say, opposed to the course adopted by the Catholic clergy. The controversy, we believe, arose on the occasion of the marriage of a certain Catholic Government official to a Protestant lady. The parties had intended that the marriage ceremony should be performed both in the Catholic church and in a Protestant place of worship, but the priest of the parish informed the bridegroom, as it was his duty to do, that such an arrangement was unlawful for him. However, Prince-Bishop Herzog, at Breslau, has forbidden his clergy to celebrate any marriage of a Catholic with a Protestant when the parties had already been married by a Protestant minister, or when the performance of such a ceremony, after the celebration of the marriage in the Catholic church, was in contemplation. To everyone in this country, Protestant and Catholic alike, nothing unreasonable will be found in all this. The rules of the Church are well known, and if a Protestant intends to marry a Catholic the terms on which it can be rightly done are fully understood. For a Protestant to be married in a Catholic church is no hardship, and offers against no Protestant party, we have ever heard of. For a Catholic to be married in a Protestant place of worship and by a Protestant minister is a distinct and willful offence against the principles of his religion. To have a marriage celebrated both by a priest and by a Protestant minister is evidently absurd, even if it be nothing worse. Suppose that in the case of a mixed marriage in England the parties repair to the Protestant minister, the Catholic party is guilty of grievous sin, and cannot receive the grace of the Sacrament of Matrimony until that sin is sincerely repented of and forgiven in the Sacrament of Penance—a *valid* marriage has been contracted. It will not be necessary, and it will not be possible, for the priest, for the simple reason that they have been married already—and the marriage though improperly contracted, is still perfectly valid. In the same way it is obviously absurd—if it be nothing worse—for the parties in a mixed marriage to betake themselves to a Protestant minister and go through a marriage ceremony, if they have already been married by a priest. In the Catholic party it is not only absurd, it is something worse. What is to be said of a Catholic who, having been duly married, consents to seek for himself and his wife, as if they were still unmarried, the nuptial "blessing" of a heretic? All this is perfectly well understood in this country, and English good sense does not tolerate the idea that a marriage, once contracted, may be repeated on the same day and by the same parties. Unhappily the case is otherwise in Germany, and certain journals there have not been ashamed to make capital against the Church out of the occurrence to which we have alluded above. The pretext is flimsy enough, but it serves no doubt as well as any other, when the object is to open a quarrel which it was not too much to say when it is remembered that some journals have had the hardihood to assert that the Catholic Church considers all Protestant marriages to be invalid. This is sufficient indication of the tone of the controversy, and the knowledge displayed by the assailants of the clergy. But let that pass. When once the question of how the Church regards the Protestant marriages had been stated, the semi-official North German Gazette took upon itself the task of making further inquiries into the matter. Very soon it discovered that the decree of the Council of Trent was promulgated some years ago at Berlin. It found that a provision from the Catholic clergy was placarded at the doors of all the churches of the capital, informing the faithful that henceforth Catholic and mixed marriages not contracted in accordance with the form prescribed by the Council of Trent were null and void. Consequently such marriages, to be valid, must be concluded in the presence of the parish priest and, at

least, two witnesses. This is the sum and substance of the matter. And on account of this the Church is being held up to the indignance of Germany as most notoriously intolerant and censorious the hatred of all true Protestants. Why so? Merely because she will not admit that marriages in which one of the parties is Catholic may be contracted before a Protestant minister quite as well as before a Catholic parish priest. Now, is there in reality anything intolerant in the declaration of the clergy of Berlin? It should be observed that it leaves Protestants and their marriages quite alone, and is concerned only with marriages in which one of the parties is a Catholic. Yet it is precisely this circumstance that renders it, according to the Protestant press, so unacceptably intolerant. When Catholics in Germany and elsewhere have greater intolerance to complain of than Protestants should make known their own tenets to their own people, a marvellous change will have passed over the face of society.

MIXED MARRIAGES IN GERMANY.

Liverpool Catholic Times.

The troubles of Catholics in Germany are not yet at an end, in spite of the progress which has this year been made towards a solution of the differences which had so unhappily arisen between the Church and the Government. Last week the news was current, that Herr Von Schaefer, Prussian Minister at the Vatican, had been invited to pay a visit to Prince Bismarck before returning to Rome; and the announcement was received with surprise, as it was well known that the ambassador had already taken final leave of the Imperial Chancellor. That some reason of special importance must exist for this second visit, was evident, and there was probably good ground for the opinion that it was to be found in the unfortunate circumstances that fresh complications have arisen between the Church and State in Prussia on the subject of the marriage laws, and that the Emperor feels strongly on the subject—being, it is needless to say, opposed to the course adopted by the Catholic clergy. The controversy, we believe, arose on the occasion of the marriage of a certain Catholic Government official to a Protestant lady. The parties had intended that the marriage ceremony should be performed both in the Catholic church and in a Protestant place of worship, but the priest of the parish informed the bridegroom, as it was his duty to do, that such an arrangement was unlawful for him. However, Prince-Bishop Herzog, at Breslau, has forbidden his clergy to celebrate any marriage of a Catholic with a Protestant when the parties had already been married by a Protestant minister, or when the performance of such a ceremony, after the celebration of the marriage in the Catholic church, was in contemplation. To everyone in this country, Protestant and Catholic alike, nothing unreasonable will be found in all this. The rules of the Church are well known, and if a Protestant intends to marry a Catholic the terms on which it can be rightly done are fully understood. For a Protestant to be married in a Catholic church is no hardship, and offers against no Protestant party, we have ever heard of. For a Catholic to be married in a Protestant place of worship and by a Protestant minister is a distinct and willful offence against the principles of his religion. To have a marriage celebrated both by a priest and by a Protestant minister is evidently absurd, even if it be nothing worse. Suppose that in the case of a mixed marriage in England the parties repair to the Protestant minister, the Catholic party is guilty of grievous sin, and cannot receive the grace of the Sacrament of Matrimony until that sin is sincerely repented of and forgiven in the Sacrament of Penance—a *valid* marriage has been contracted. It will not be necessary, and it will not be possible, for the priest, for the simple reason that they have been married already—and the marriage though improperly contracted, is still perfectly valid. In the same way it is obviously absurd—if it be nothing worse—for the parties in a mixed marriage to betake themselves to a Protestant minister and go through a marriage ceremony, if they have already been married by a priest. In the Catholic party it is not only absurd, it is something worse. What is to be said of a Catholic who, having been duly married, consents to seek for himself and his wife, as if they were still unmarried, the nuptial "blessing" of a heretic? All this is perfectly well understood in this country, and English good sense does not tolerate the idea that a marriage, once contracted, may be repeated on the same day and by the same parties. Unhappily the case is otherwise in Germany, and certain journals there have not been ashamed to make capital against the Church out of the occurrence to which we have alluded above. The pretext is flimsy enough, but it serves no doubt as well as any other, when the object is to open a quarrel which it was not too much to say when it is remembered that some journals have had the hardihood to assert that the Catholic Church considers all Protestant marriages to be invalid. This is sufficient indication of the tone of the controversy, and the knowledge displayed by the assailants of the clergy. But let that pass. When once the question of how the Church regards the Protestant marriages had been stated, the semi-official North German Gazette took upon itself the task of making further inquiries into the matter. Very soon it discovered that the decree of the Council of Trent was promulgated some years ago at Berlin. It found that a provision from the Catholic clergy was placarded at the doors of all the churches of the capital, informing the faithful that henceforth Catholic and mixed marriages not contracted in accordance with the form prescribed by the Council of Trent were null and void. Consequently such marriages, to be valid, must be concluded in the presence of the parish priest and, at

least, two witnesses. This is the sum and substance of the matter. And on account of this the Church is being held up to the indignance of Germany as most notoriously intolerant and censorious the hatred of all true Protestants. Why so? Merely because she will not admit that marriages in which one of the parties is Catholic may be contracted before a Protestant minister quite as well as before a Catholic parish priest. Now, is there in reality anything intolerant in the declaration of the clergy of Berlin? It should be observed that it leaves Protestants and their marriages quite alone, and is concerned only with marriages in which one of the parties is a Catholic. Yet it is precisely this circumstance that renders it, according to the Protestant press, so unacceptably intolerant. When Catholics in Germany and elsewhere have greater intolerance to complain of than Protestants should make known their own tenets to their own people, a marvellous change will have passed over the face of society.

MIXED MARRIAGES IN GERMANY.

Liverpool Catholic Times.

The troubles of Catholics in Germany are not yet at an end, in spite of the progress which has this year been made towards a solution of the differences which had so unhappily arisen between the Church and the Government. Last week the news was current, that Herr Von Schaefer, Prussian Minister at the Vatican, had been invited to pay a visit to Prince Bismarck before returning to Rome; and the announcement was received with surprise, as it was well known that the ambassador had already taken final leave of the Imperial Chancellor. That some reason of special importance must exist for this second visit, was evident, and there was probably good ground for the opinion that it was to be found in the unfortunate circumstances that fresh complications have arisen between the Church and State in Prussia on the subject of the marriage laws, and that the Emperor feels strongly on the subject—being, it is needless to say, opposed to the course adopted by the Catholic clergy. The controversy, we believe, arose on the occasion of the marriage of a certain Catholic Government official to a Protestant lady. The parties had intended that the marriage ceremony should be performed both in the Catholic church and in a Protestant place of worship, but the priest of the parish informed the bridegroom, as it was his duty to do, that such an arrangement was unlawful for him. However, Prince-Bishop Herzog, at Breslau, has forbidden his clergy to celebrate any marriage of a Catholic with a Protestant when the parties had already been married by a Protestant minister, or when the performance of such a ceremony, after the celebration of the marriage in the Catholic church, was in contemplation. To everyone in this country, Protestant and Catholic alike, nothing unreasonable will be found in all this. The rules of the Church are well known, and if a Protestant intends to marry a Catholic the terms on which it can be rightly done are fully understood. For a Protestant to be married in a Catholic church is no hardship, and offers against no Protestant party, we have ever heard of. For a Catholic to be married in a Protestant place of worship and by a Protestant minister is a distinct and willful offence against