

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 454 and 496 Richmond Street, London, Ontario. Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITOR: REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

PUBLISHER AND PROPRIETOR: THOMAS COFFEY, Messrs. Luke King, John Nigh, P. J. Neven and Joseph S. King, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertisement—Ten cents per line each insertion, agree measurement.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of Hamilton, Peterborough, and Ogdensburg, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.

When subscribers change their residence it is important that they send the new address in advance.

London, Saturday, Sept. 24, 1898.

CHURCH AND STATE.

By a declaration of Congress of date March 3rd, 1897, the policy of the United States Government is announced to be "to make no appropriations of money or property for the purpose of founding, maintaining, or aiding by payment for services, expenses, or otherwise, any Church or religious denomination, or any institution or society which is under sectarian or ecclesiastical control."

Notwithstanding this declaration, it was enacted on June 30th, 1898, that six institutions in Washington which are under control of religious bodies should receive appropriations.

As four of the six are Catholic institutions, the Apapists endeavored to prevent payment of the money under the Act of 1897.

But the Hon. B. J. Tracewell, Controller of the Treasury, has decided that the appropriation made in 1898 repeats the prohibition of 1897, and the money is therefore to be paid.

Thus the A. P. A. sustains another defeat.

It would be an injustice to deny assistance to a charitable institution, on the plea that it is under religious control.

It would be to set a premium upon the ignoring of all religion.

HIGH AND LOW.

A vigorous fight is expected to take place between the High and Low Church parties of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States at the General Synod which will meet in Washington on Oct. 5. The question of divorce and the marriage of divorced persons will be one which will be keenly disputed.

The High Church party are in favor of laying aside the epithet Protestant in the name of the Church, and of calling it the "American Church," or the "American Catholic Church," either of which names would be most incongruous.

A ZULU PRIEST.

The first Zulu who has attained to the sacred order of the priesthood is the Rev. E. K. Mullet, who was ordained in Rome on June 5, 1898. He is a secular priest, though his ordination to the priesthood is the result of Trappist missionary labors.

He went to Rome in the year of the jubilee of Leo XIII., and remained to prosecute his studies at the College of the Propaganda.

The Trappists went to Natal in 1882, and within two years purchased 7,000 acres of land near the monastery which they then built. In 1887 they had established two schools with 200 pupils.

To-day the number of schools has multiplied, and they are now educating, clothing, boarding and lodging 14,000 native children, and there are in South Africa twenty-three Trappist stations with 600 monks and nuns.

Father Mullet, the Zulu priest, is now on his way to evangelize the Zululand countrymen. He returns to Zululand in company with the Trappist Abbot, the Right Rev. Abbot Franz.

KENSIT'S APPEAL.

Mr. Kensit, the leader of the movement to create disturbances in all the Ritualistic Churches of England, has made an appeal to the Low Church opponents of Ritualism to establish a fund to send out evangelical speakers throughout the country, to give information to the people generally concerning the dreadful inroads made by the Ritualistically inclined clergy on the true Protestant faith, and also to incite the opposition of the people against the introduction of Ritualistic practices into the Church services.

He accuses the Bishops, with one or two exceptions, of favoring Ritualism, so that it is of no use to appeal to them to suppress this evil.

He declares that it is only through the intense Protestantism of the people that Ritualism can be suppressed, and he wishes to induce the people throughout England to imitate in their churches the means which he has adopted in London to terrorize the Ritualistic clergy by interrupting the Church services where distasteful ceremonies are used.

RUPTURE IN AN UNEXPECTED QUARTER.

Two petitions were presented to the recently held Methodist General Conference asking that the public worship of Methodism should be made more interesting by the introduction of the creed and certain ceremonial rites which would serve to render it more attractive to the young and more respectful to Almighty God.

They were referred to the Committee on Discipline for consideration. Thus we see the most anti-ritualistic of Protestant sects showing a disposition to introduce a more becoming ritual into their worship.

It is beginning to be seen that in demanding a form of worship stripped of all outward solemnity, the Protestantism of the past made a serious mistake. It is now being admitted on all hands that the adoration of God "in spirit and in truth" does not exclude the use of a solemn ritual or ceremonial in the Church.

This is a tardy acknowledgment that the Catholic Church is wise in using such a ceremonial.

No one who reads the book of Leviticus with moderate attention will deny that under the old law God established an elaborate ceremonial for public worship. It will be said by some, as it has often been before, that this is no criterion for the use of a religious ceremonial, as the Jewish ceremonial laws passed away at the advent of Christ.

It is true that the ceremonies of Judaism are no longer of obligation, but it still remains true that Almighty God had a wise and beneficent purpose in establishing them, and that the reasons which made them useful during the period of the Mosaic law still exist in the nature of man.

These ceremonies were instituted, first, to symbolize the mysteries of religion and to impress them strongly upon the minds of men; 2dly, to inspire respect and devotion for God while we offer Him our worship; 3dly, to attach men to their religion. Human nature is the same now as it was three thousand years ago, and we need aids to devotion similar to those which were deemed necessary at that time; not, indeed, exactly the same ceremonies which were then deemed most impressive, inasmuch as the mysteries of religion made known to Christians are more extensive and of deeper import, but for that very reason the importance of showing our respect for them, and of having them put strongly before our minds by an appropriate religious ceremonial, is all the greater.

The Jews are greatly attached to their religion, even at the present day. It is well known that it is the outward respect they are obliged to show for it through their religious ordinances that keeps up this attachment. Montesquien, the author of the Spirit of Laws, fully appreciated this effect of a respectful ceremonial, and said of the ceremonial laws of the Jews: "A religion which is loaded with many rites attaches men more strongly to it than one that has fewer. The things which we are continually doing become very dear to us. Hence, the tenacious obstinacy of the Jews."

The ceremonies of the Jews and those of the Catholic Church differ in their object, as those of the old law had their end in Christ as the expected Messiah, whereas those of the Catholic Church have been instituted in remembrance of Christ who has actually come. But the design of both is the same to this extent, that they excite reverence for religion, and explain the benefits we derive therefrom.

It is by such considerations that the Ritualists of England have been led to adopt many Catholic rites, and some ones of their own invention, and it is the universal testimony that the

Ritual they have introduced has greatly increased devotion in their parishes. But give a dog a bad name and it will bring on him the hatred of the whole community, so it is by calling the Ritualists Romanists in disguise that the London populace have been excited to late to the scenes of rioting in churches which have disgraced that city. In the opinion of the extreme Protestants, even a good thing becomes pernicious if it is used by "Romanists."

But Ritualism is making headway in spite of all effort to put it down; yet we must say we scarcely expected to find the question seriously discussed in a General Methodist Conference, though the Ritualism in this case is of a very moderate character. Still, the principle at stake is the same—that an appropriate ceremonial has a powerful influence upon the mind of man.

Recent discussions on the subject show that even among Methodists the conviction is growing that this is the case, and a certain moderate amount, at least, of Ritualism is being loudly demanded by some among them to be introduced into the Church services "to attract the young, and nourish fervor in devotion."

We should here add, that in England there is an authorized Ritual for those Methodists who have the inclination to use it, but its use appears to be optional. There is a demand in some quarters that it should be introduced also in Canada.

CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT DOCTRINE AND PROGRESS.

We have received a communication from "G. L." of Morden, wherein the writer undertakes to lecture us on the errors of "Romanism." Nevertheless he admits that he admires "Romanism" for "many things" among which is our "stand on the divorce question."

If our correspondent were to reflect seriously on the matter he would undoubtedly find that not only on the divorce question, but on every question of Christian faith, the Catholic Church is right, because it adheres constantly and unswervingly to the faith which Christ delivered to His Apostles, to be taught to "all nations." (St. Matt. xxviii : 19, 20)

The Protestant sects waver on this point as on every Christian doctrine, because admitted they have no sure Church authority against which the gates of hell shall not prevail. (St. Matt. xvi, 18.) and which is the "pillar and ground of truth." (1 Tim. iii, 15.)

Our correspondent says he "belongs to no Church and has no prejudice against any denomination," but he thinks the Bible "is the only rule of faith worth following."

All sects make the same boast with G. L., that they follow the Bible as their only rule of faith, yet we all know into what absurdities and vagaries they have all wandered. It should be clear to every one that this is not the sure guide which St. Paul designates "the pillar and ground of truth," and of which he speaks elsewhere (Eph. iv : 3, 14), that we must be in one body and one Spirit, keeping the unity of the spirit, under the teaching of Apostles, Prophets and other teachers, that we may not be children carried about with every wind of doctrine.

Our correspondent's rule of faith does not effect this for himself any more than for all the sects, which he repudiates, thus setting himself up for the only possessor of true faith among the millions who follow the same guide as himself. We would remind him that St. Peter tells us that we have the word of prophecy, to which we do well to attend; yet that we must "understand first, that no prophecy of Scripture is made by private interpretation, because it came not by the will of man, but by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost." (2 Pet. i : 19-21)

The Bible nowhere tells us that the writers of the various books of which it is composed intended it to be the sole rule of faith for Christians, or that it should take the place of the Church in directing us on the way of salvation. On the contrary, as we have already shown, it insists upon our hearing the Church, and following its teachings, and that Church can be no other than the Catholic Church, which alone has had a constant existence since it was established by Christ.

We have not space here for a full treatise on the authority of the Church, but we recommend our friend to read on this subject some standard treatise, such as Milner's *End of Controversy*, Hay's *Sincere Christian*, or the *Faith of Our Fathers* by Cardinal Gibbons.

Against the Catholic use of sacred images in Churches, G. L. quotes the commandment (Ex. xx : 4, 5 : Prot.

Bible), "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image. . . Thou shalt not bow down thyself to them nor serve them."

He says: "The moment one enters a Catholic Church, he sees the people bowing to images." If he had looked further into his Bible he would have found that God commanded "two cherubims of beaten gold" to be set "on the two sides of the propitiatory" in the Mosaic tabernacle. (Ex. xxxvii, 7.) cherubims likewise to be set in the temple of Solomon. (3 Ki. vi : 23, 27, 32.) and a brazen serpent, which the Israelites were to look upon that they might be healed when bitten by fiery serpents. (Num. xxi.)

Our correspondent might have inferred from all this that images are not absolutely forbidden by the commandment of the decalogue, but only images to be adored and served idolatrously.

Sacred images have always been used in the Church of Christ as aids to bring to our minds more powerfully the virtues of the saints, and the mysteries of religion, as the image of Christ crucified impresses upon us what Christ suffered for our sins, and thus tends to increase our love for Him, and to make us appreciate more fully the blessings of redemption. This use of images is not forbidden in the Bible; but the Protestant translators of the Bible have wrongfully put "graven image" for graven thing "or idol, to make it appear that all images are forbidden by the commandment. They themselves, however, violate the commandment as they have framed it themselves, for they frequently have images of departed and living friends decorating their houses, images of the queen or prominent statesman or soldier in their public parks, etc., without suspecting for a moment that they are violating one of the commandments of God.

G. L. declares, in the next place, that Catholics worship "Mary and the Saints," a practice for which he can "see no Scripture warrant."

Will he find a Scripture warrant for calling the mayors of our cities, "their worshipers" or for the words of the bridegroom to his future wife: "with my body I thee worship," used in the marriage ceremony of the Church of England?

The word worship is used in English somewhat vaguely, being sometimes employed for the honor due to God, and sometimes for any earnest act of reverence. We certainly do not give to the Saints the honor due to God, but we honor and reverence them, and for this there is ample scriptural authority, but we prefer not to use the word worship in reference to the saints, on account of its being now generally applied to God alone. Among the many passages of Scripture which show that the saints should be honored we may quote: "Glory and honor, and peace to every one that worketh good." (Rom. ii, 10.) "This glory (Prot. Bible, "honor") is to all His Saints." (P. s. clix, 9.)

Our esteemed correspondent speaks of yet another point, the illiteracy of those of the Catholic Church. Its Mass, though said in the Russian language, is in substance the same with that of Catholics, and on all points on which there is a disagreement between Catholics and Protestants, with the single exception of the universal authority and jurisdiction of the Pope, the Russian teaching is the same as that of the Catholic Church; and even on this point of the Pope's authority, there are to be found prayers in the Mass book in use among the Russians and Greeks, which recognize the Pope's supremacy. Such prayers are recited on the festivals of Popes Sylvester, Leo and other Roman Pontiffs. It would surely be a grievous shock to an Anglican congregator to have to join in such prayers, if a Greek or Russian priest visiting England or Canada were to recite these prayers in an Anglican Cathedral in London or Toronto, where he might be celebrating Mass by virtue of the treaty of union which it was hoped would be agreed upon between the Lambeth Committee and the Oriental Church authorities. We may imagine with what indignation the Kenists and other fanatics would denounce such a mode of worship. It would be bad enough to ask the intercession of three Saints, but to acknowledge that they exercised authority over the whole Church of Christ would be an unparalleled outrage on modern Low Churchism. The only thing which might prevent these fanatics from mobbing the celebrant would be that they would not understand him, through ignorance of the language in which these prayers were being said.

There would, however, be enough to excite their suspicion in the ceremonial of the Russian Mass, in whatever language it might be celebrated, for the Russian ceremonial is by far more complex than that of the Latin Mass of the West. In fact, this complexity of Oriental ritual has been brought to the notice of the public, through the fact that there have been negotiations for union between the Churches, and some of the London papers are uttering their thanks that negotiations have ended without fruit, so that now there is at present no danger of witnessing this extreme of Ritualism in any of the London Churches. The papers are also thankful that the Union is not to take place, because the Church of England is already shaken to its base by the divisions which even now exist within it. Its condition would be more hopeless than ever if to these sources of dissension were added the dissensions which rend asunder the Schismatical Churches of the east, the Greek, Russian, Servian, and Abyssinian, the Nestorian, Eutychnian, Gregorian, and Monothelite. The Babel would be more unendurable than ever. In fact, the Non-Conformist journal already quoted strikes the nail on the head when it says:

"We repeat that only those ignorant of the real state of Oriental Christianity, can excessively imagine that reunion with it would be anything but a curse."

ANGLICANISM AND ORIENTALISM.

The 36th resolution passed by the Lambeth Conference or Pan-Anglican Council in 1867 appointed the Archbishop of Canterbury and York, and the Bishop of London to act as a committee to confer with the Holy Synod of Russia, and the authorities of the other Eastern Churches, with a view to bringing about a closer union between them and the Church of England.

This resolution was evidently intended as an answer to the Pope for his Bull declaring the invalidity of Anglican orders. It was equivalent to telling the Holy Father and the world that if the Catholic Church refuses to acknowledge the ecclesiastical status of a man made ministry, there are other Churches, at least, which would be glad to extend the right hand of fellowship to a sacerdotal organization which the Catholic Church refuses to recognize as having received its ministerial powers by direct succession from the Apostles of Christ, and therefore from Christ Himself.

Communications were held with the various Greek and other schismatical Churches of the East to carry out the plan of the Lambeth assemblage, and the three prelates named have issued a lengthy report on the subject. We have not seen the report itself, but we learn from English papers that it reveals the fact that no satisfactory reply has been received, and the Pan-Anglican committee has really nothing to announce, though it has spun out the report to great length. One London Non-Conformist paper, the Christian Commonwealth, describes the report as "a curious document" which is "a fine instance of the ecclesiastical art of saying nothing at immense length."

Archdeacon Sinclair has issued a charge based upon the report of the two Archbishops and the Bishop of London, in which he gives a history of the Eastern Churches, and at the same time reasons for the want of success which has attended the efforts of the three Anglican prelates. The principal reason for this is that the so-called "Orthodox Eastern Church" is as hopelessly split up into sects as Western Protestantism itself, though the fragments are much larger than are most of the Protestant sects.

The Church of Russia is, of course, the largest of these sects, but nothing can be more unlike Protestantism of any form than the Russian Church. Its doctrines are almost identical with those of the Catholic Church. Its Mass, though said in the Russian language, is in substance the same with that of Catholics, and on all points on which there is a disagreement between Catholics and Protestants, with the single exception of the universal authority and jurisdiction of the Pope, the Russian teaching is the same as that of the Catholic Church; and even on this point of the Pope's authority, there are to be found prayers in the Mass book in use among the Russians and Greeks, which recognize the Pope's supremacy. Such prayers are recited on the festivals of Popes Sylvester, Leo and other Roman Pontiffs. It would surely be a grievous shock to an Anglican congregator to have to join in such prayers, if a Greek or Russian priest visiting England or Canada were to recite these prayers in an Anglican Cathedral in London or Toronto, where he might be celebrating Mass by virtue of the treaty of union which it was hoped would be agreed upon between the Lambeth Committee and the Oriental Church authorities. We may imagine with what indignation the Kenists and other fanatics would denounce such a mode of worship. It would be bad enough to ask the intercession of three Saints, but to acknowledge that they exercised authority over the whole Church of Christ would be an unparalleled outrage on modern Low Churchism. The only thing which might prevent these fanatics from mobbing the celebrant would be that they would not understand him, through ignorance of the language in which these prayers were being said.

There would, however, be enough to excite their suspicion in the ceremonial of the Russian Mass, in whatever language it might be celebrated, for the Russian ceremonial is by far more complex than that of the Latin Mass of the West. In fact, this complexity of Oriental ritual has been brought to the notice of the public, through the fact that there have been negotiations for union between the Churches, and some of the London papers are uttering their thanks that negotiations have ended without fruit, so that now there is at present no danger of witnessing this extreme of Ritualism in any of the London Churches. The papers are also thankful that the Union is not to take place, because the Church of England is already shaken to its base by the divisions which even now exist within it. Its condition would be more hopeless than ever if to these sources of dissension were added the dissensions which rend asunder the Schismatical Churches of the east, the Greek, Russian, Servian, and Abyssinian, the Nestorian, Eutychnian, Gregorian, and Monothelite. The Babel would be more unendurable than ever. In fact, the Non-Conformist journal already quoted strikes the nail on the head when it says:

"We repeat that only those ignorant of the real state of Oriental Christianity, can excessively imagine that reunion with it would be anything but a curse."

in whatever language it might be celebrated, for the Russian ceremonial is by far more complex than that of the Latin Mass of the West. In fact, this complexity of Oriental ritual has been brought to the notice of the public, through the fact that there have been negotiations for union between the Churches, and some of the London papers are uttering their thanks that negotiations have ended without fruit, so that now there is at present no danger of witnessing this extreme of Ritualism in any of the London Churches. The papers are also thankful that the Union is not to take place, because the Church of England is already shaken to its base by the divisions which even now exist within it.

Its condition would be more hopeless than ever if to these sources of dissension were added the dissensions which rend asunder the Schismatical Churches of the east, the Greek, Russian, Servian, and Abyssinian, the Nestorian, Eutychnian, Gregorian, and Monothelite. The Babel would be more unendurable than ever. In fact, the Non-Conformist journal already quoted strikes the nail on the head when it says:

"We repeat that only those ignorant of the real state of Oriental Christianity, can excessively imagine that reunion with it would be anything but a curse."

THE SOUTH METHODIST CHURCH WAR CLAIM SCANDAL.

The claim of the Methodist Episcopal Church for \$458,400, as compensation for injuries done to their book establishment during the war, is still being discussed by the American press, but the discussion is now confined almost entirely to the Methodist papers. Our readers will remember that the claim was compromised by the payment of \$288,000, of which amount Mr. Stahlman, the lawyer who pulled the wires to influence Congress, received \$100,000 for his services.

The point now being most discussed is the deception practised by the book agents and Mr. Stahlman, in order to have Congress pay the claim.

The defence which is set up by members of the Methodist denomination is that the Church itself knew nothing of the contract with Mr. Stahlman, and was not responsible for the deceit of the book agents, who authorized the promoters of the bill in the Senate to deny that any percentage was to be given to the lawyer who engineered the matter. It is certain, however, that the engineering of Mr. Stahlman would not have been successful if the whole influence of the Church authorities had not backed up his efforts, and the Bishops themselves have admitted that they did so, so that their washing their hands out of the transaction must be regarded as a mere ruse for dramatic effect.

A recent issue of the New York Christian Advocate says this of the transaction:

"No man could afford to do business with his fellowmen if it were understood that such answers could be given to such questions—unless he adopted the degrading principle that every man is to be considered a rogue until he is found to be honest. The problems raised as to what should be done with the money and how the agents should be dealt with, call for the utmost wisdom. As respects the latter, so long as they defend themselves, or are responsibly defended, silence and inaction give consent. . . Should it be asked why we feel called upon to treat this subject, the answer is at hand. The scandal has tarnished the name of Methodism; the report of the Senate gives it world-wide and lasting publicity; the sin into which the agents fell, and the methods of vindication or extenuation adopted in their behalf are so pernicious and so contrary to the plain condemnation in God's word of those who do evil that good may come, that our silence might be construed into mystification upon a case of common morality; and, besides, if such men may so err, we and the whole Church need a warning."

Thus, the Advocate admits that the Church authorities "responsibly defended" the deception; and it is conceded that the methods employed by these responsibly defended book-agents, of whom one, Mr. Barbee, is a minister of 46 years' standing in the Church, were indefensible, but an attempt is made to exonerate the Church itself from the charge of wrong doing in the matter. It is clear, however, that such a claim would not have been paid at all were it not that it was put forth by the Methodist Church. The American Government did not pay war losses to private individuals who were engaged in the Confederate cause, and there was no valid reason for paying the Methodist claim at all, more especially as that Church was officially as deeply involved in the rebellion of secession as any body of men in the South. Besides, the claim is declared by experts to have been far beyond the losses which the Church endured, and which were attributable to destructive acts of the Federal army.

So bear your cross that those coming after you may derive strength and courage from your example.

A GRAND RECEPTION.

The Religious of the Sacred Heart of America and their pupils, both old and new, have this year been graciously honored by a special rejoicing.

The head of the Order, Mother Ignatius, has undertaken the arduous yet pleasant task of visiting a house of the Sacred Heart in the world. Greetings of the most affectionate character have already been tendered her, not only by her daughters in religion, but by the most distinguished of the Canadian clergy and laity. . . . She has made a visitation of the house in Halifax, Sault au Recollet, Montreal, and Rochester, N. Y. From our knowledge of the work being done by devoted Religious we may confidently say that the good Mother's heart must have been gladdened to note how much the labors of the Community have been appreciated by all classes of the people.

On Saturday last Reverend Mother Ignatius left Rochester for London. She was accompanied on the journey by Mother Stuart and Mother Guerin. At Woodstock, thirty miles east, were met by a deputation of the nuns of the Sacred Heart, consisting of Mrs. Jas. Wilson, Mrs. P. Mulvihill, Mrs. R. M. Burns, Miss Jennie W. Miss Kate Gleason and Miss P. Higgins of Detroit. The members of the Society were in waiting at the depot at 6 o'clock. On the arrival of the train a very warm welcome was tendered the distinguished visitor. She was driven to the Convent on Queen Avenue, accompanied by several of the Children of Mary.

On their arrival at the beautiful home of the Sacred Heart Community a most enchanting sight presented itself. Twilight had just faded into night, and myriads of lanterns presented a scene that was easily forgotten. Numerous parences appeared in many ways bearing the inscription: "Cor et anima una in corde Jesu." "Dies quam fecit Dominus." "Notre Mere," "Ced mille fois," "The pupils, over one hundred in number, in convent uniform and veils, presented a touching scene, feelingly sang, "Vive, Notre Mere au Sacre Cour. Qu'heure!"

The corridor leading to the chapel was illuminated in a most tasteful manner. When Reverend Mother Ignatius reached the chapel the community pupils joined in singing the "Miserere" in thanksgiving to Almighty God for the safe arrival of the loved and revered Mother. The scene, from the arrival of the Mother at the convent, until the close of the festivities, was a fitting illustration of the love and regard in which distinguished visitors in held by the daughters in religion in far away Canada.

On Monday morning took place the reception of the children. The large study hall was tastefully decorated in yellow and white—the colors of the Pope. The British, American and Mexican flags were gracefully ranged at one end of the room, the other, holding a conspicuous crest of the Sacred Heart Society. The reception, opened by instrumental piece, pianos and followed by a dialogue, in which children extended to their mother a hearty welcome. It was pretty and most charming proceeding and touched the heart of the mother, a notable trait of character is a warm and constant for little children. The room closed with a magnificent rendering of "Praise ye the Lord," a chorus of pupils.

A reception was tendered the Mother Ignatius after noon. The president, Mrs. Ellen O'Brien, president, Mrs. James Wilson, credit is due for the faultless manner in which the arrangements were made. The address of welcome was given by Mrs. Robt. Muir Burns. Stand aside here two little girls, Wilson and Rowena Burns, whose conclusion of the address, by Reverend Mother with flowers, was as follows:

Very Reverend and Dear Mother, On behalf of the Children of London I bid you welcome. Greeting my associates extend occasion of gladness is not a formal salutation; a tribute of love is the heart's welcome.

We are cognizant of your worth, dear Very Reverend Mother, you hold the highest place in our hearts. You have come to us, a benefactor, bestowing upon us the blessing of your presence, value known only to God. Come from your Convent home, happy Paris. You have come to us, miles; come, as it were, from other world, to witness the ceaseless, holy labors of those that bear a vow of fealty to the Heart of Our Blessed Redeemer. You are in a new world, in many ways from the land of birth and the land wherein performing your part in God's work. National character will here find varying in many of those of Europe, but in respect, dear Very Reverend Mother, find no change. The Children of the land of Columbus true to the common ideal as seen in the Sacred Heart of Jesus, beseech you, their guiding Holy Heart of Mary their