

The Catholic Record.

"Christianus mihi nomen est Catholicus vero Cognomen."—(Christian is my Name, but Catholic my Surname)—St. Paclan, 4th Century.

VOLUME XXXIV.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1912

1768

The Gossip
See you the Gossip go by,
Her tongue a consuming fire,
Fell slayer of Friendship, King of Joy,
She holds Reputation a worthless toy,
Careless wherever her venomous shafts fly,
Or on whom she vents her ire.
She's like the despised of old—
The hypocrite Pharisee—
A she-wolf disguised in the Master's fold,
Long are the prayers and the beads she's told,
She even gives of her generous gold,
But naught of her charity.
She's jury and judge and all—
To try the accused of men,
Lengthy the panel that answers her call,
The good and the true are alimed with
her gall,
For over each action she spreads the pall
Of most deliberate sin.
The hidden sins of the weak
She prates in the open mar,
Ah, little she cares that the mild and meek
Hath had us of naught but the good to speak,
And even the gem in the mire to seek,
If with Him we'd fain have part.
Ah, Gossip! we pray you pause,
Ah, you on the serpent sting!
Ah, why will you look for the hidden flaws?
Why batten on refuse and filth because
The "Thinketh no Evil" seems all the laws
That dawn through the ages ring?
—REV. D. A. CASEY.

THE GREAT NEWMAN

HIS CONVERSION

Simple and touching were the circumstances of the reception of Cardinal Newman into the Catholic Church. It took place at Littlemore on the evening of October 8, 1845. It came to the knowledge of Newman that Father Dominic, a Passionist Father, would be passing that way on the date named, and without even giving a hint why he made the request sent him word he would like to see him. We give the story of his conversion as follows taken from Ward's life of the great Cardinal:

On the evening of October 8, Father Dominic was expected, and almost at the same time Stanton, who had been absent for a few weeks, returned. Father Dominic was to arrive at Oxford by the coach in the afternoon. Up to the very day itself Newman did not speak to the community at Littlemore of his intention. Dalgairns and St. John were to meet the Passionist Father in Oxford. The former has left the following account of what passed:

"At that time all of us except St. John, though we did not doubt Newman would become a Catholic, were anxious and ignorant of his intentions in detail. About 3 o'clock I went to take my hat and stick and walk across the fields to the Oxford 'Angel' where the coach stopped. As I was taking my stick Newman said to me in a very low and quiet tone: 'When you see your friend, will you tell him that I wish him to receive me into the Church of Christ?' I said 'Yes' and no more. I told Father Dominic as he was dismounting from the top of the coach. He said: 'God be praised, and neither of us spoke again till we reached Littlemore.'

It was then pouring with rain. Newman made his general confession that night, and was afterwards quite prostrate. Ambrose St. John and Stanton helped him out of the little oratory. On the morrow his diary has this record: 'Admitted into the Catholic Church with Bowles and Stanton.' Next day Newman made his first Communion in the oratory at Littlemore, in which Mass was said for the first time, and Father Dominic received Mr. and Mrs. Woodman and their two daughters. Newman walked into Oxford in the afternoon with St. John to see Mr. Newsham, the Catholic priest. On the eleventh Father Dominic left. On the same day Newman paid a visit to W. G. Ward at Rose Hill, and Charles Marriott came to see him at Littlemore.

Thus very quietly and without parade took place the great event dreamt of for so many years—with dread at first, in hope at last. The MS. of the 'Essay on Development' lay unfinished on his desk. Newman now added a few lines to it which give the best contemporary picture of his mind at the time—'one of those passages,' writes Mr. Hutton, 'by which Newman will be remembered as long as the English language endures.'

"Such," he wrote "were the thoughts concerning 'The Blessed Vision of Peace' of one whose long-continued petition had been that the Most Merciful would not despise the work of His own hands, nor leave him to himself; while yet his eyes were dim, and his breast laden, and he could but employ Reason in the things of Faith. And now, dear reader, time is short, eternity is long. Put not from you what you have here found; regard it not as mere matter of present controversy; set not out resolved to refute it, and looking about for the best way of doing so; seduce not yourself with the imagination that it comes of disappointment, or disgust, or restlessness, or other feeling, or undue sensibility, or other weakness. Wrap not yourself round in the associations of years past, nor determine that to be truth which you wish to be so, nor make an idol of cherished anticipations. Time is short, eternity is long. 'Nunc dimittis servum tuum, Domine, secundum verbum tuum in pace, quia viderunt oculi meos salutarem tuum.' The neophytes henceforth followed the simple rule of life prescribed by

Farther Dominic. On Sunday, October 12, the little church of St. Clement's, Oxford, saw for the first time the group from Littlemore—St. John, Dalgairns, and Stanton—accompanying Newman to Mass. On the 16th the same quarter again visited it to receive Communion. John Walker was admitted into the Church at Oxford on the 21st, Oakley on the 29th, on which day Father Dominic paid a second visit to Littlemore. On the 23rd Dalgairns accompanied the rest of the Littlemore party to Mass at St. Clement's and then left for Oscott en route for France, where he was to read theology with his friend M. Lenzel at Langres. R. W. Church and James Robert Hope (afterwards Hope-Scott) were the only Anglican friends whom Newman saw before going up to Oscott on the 31st to receive confirmation at the hands of Dr. Wiseman.

Of the meeting between Newman and Wiseman on this occasion the late Canon Bernard Smith, who was present, gave me the following account: "The meeting between the two men was characteristic. The great Oxford leader, who had at last owned that Rome had conquered, had come, as it were, to surrender his sword to the man who had so strenuously urged surrender as his only course. Orders disowned, perfections resigned, he came in poverty and simplicity to ask for confirmation at the hands of the Bishop. His faith and conviction brought him to Oscott, but they could not untie his tongue or rid him of the embarrassment which belonged to the situation. In company with John Walker and Ambrose St. John, he was ushered into Oscott's guest-room, and in a few minutes Bishop Wiseman, with Mr. Bernard Smith and Father Ignatius Spencer, entered the room. The embarrassment was mutual, and Wiseman could scarcely find words for more than formal inquiries about the journey. Any touch of exultation or any expression of commiseration and conventional congratulation, would have been in the interest of the mind was so highly wrought that silence seemed the only possible course. The two principle figures sat almost silent, while their companions talked more readily to each other. A message which shortly announced that a boy was waiting to go to confess to the Bishop gave Wiseman an excuse for retiring, which he accepted with significant alacrity."

"The confirmation was given on November 1, the feast of All Saints, and the ice was then broken and much conversation on the past and future ensued."

UNMASKING OF SOCIALISM

We have before us a campaign document issued by a so-called National Federal Committee in the interest of catching votes for Eugene V. Debs and the national Socialist ticket. Its lack of truthfulness is only surpassed by monumental cheek and adamant effrontery. Bad English and stilted style would deserve its being passed over in contemptible silence, only as a whole, it is so unacceptably the most malicious intent. Henceforth Socialist leaders in some quarters at least have pretended a degree of friendly interest in the Catholic workingman, patting him on the back with the assurance that he could be a Socialist and a Catholic at the same time, and that denunciation of Socialism did not come from the Church at large, but from a few disgruntled ecclesiastics. The Socialist party was after the vote of Catholic workmen. But when the ranks in the Church closed and the laity united with the clergy in solid phalanx against a common enemy, Socialism ceased its temporizing and now shows its hideous teeth and diabolical grin in full view of all.

In the first place it unmasks the attitude of Socialism and the Socialist party in this country towards the Catholic Church as one of the bitterest rancor and the most malicious intent. Henceforth Socialist leaders in some quarters at least have pretended a degree of friendly interest in the Catholic workingman, patting him on the back with the assurance that he could be a Socialist and a Catholic at the same time, and that denunciation of Socialism did not come from the Church at large, but from a few disgruntled ecclesiastics. The Socialist party was after the vote of Catholic workmen. But when the ranks in the Church closed and the laity united with the clergy in solid phalanx against a common enemy, Socialism ceased its temporizing and now shows its hideous teeth and diabolical grin in full view of all.

This campaign document, revealing something of the true inwardness of Socialism, is by an almost inconceivable act of mendacious impudence headed "The Great American Protest—Romanism is the Issue."

By printer's ink it is addressed to "the American voters of every political faith; including of course the 3,000,000 and more Catholics who will cast their votes at the next presidential election; and who, if they read it at all, will likely be more amused than disgusted; though the best use of it in the end would be unmentionable."

In the first paragraph of this "Great American Protest" its sole object is explained to be "to concentrate the vote of all true Americans so as to offset the vote controlled by the Pope of Rome, through the cardinals, archbishops and priests, constituting the papal hierarchy in this country." An old, infamous slander! Catholics owe allegiance to the Pope in spiritual matters only, just as Protestants obey the laws of the general assembly, or Episcopalian the edicts of the general convention, or Methodists the ordinances of the general conference. In temporal and state matters the Catholic citizen owes obedience and fealty to the United States government, and history proves that he has given them in the fullest measure of patriotism, and so gives them to-day. It is a malicious falsehood to say that cardinal, bishop or priest uses his influence for political ends. He is forbidden to do so by the constitution and laws of the Church. The Methodist Church and other Protestant bodies are not infrequently in politics; the Catholic Church never is, nor ever can be. She seeks no control except in the spiritual domain. When this vile campaign sheet in the same paragraph goes on to say that "every civilization in the past has been destroyed by a corrupt priesthood" it so

far offends against the truth that historically it is beyond dispute that but for the Catholic Church there would have been no civilization at all.

The animus of the document, which is plainly to get votes for the Socialist presidential ticket, is expressed in the following paragraph: "Less than one-seventh of the active voters, about 1,500,000, control the election of the president, and thereby the entire policy of the government of the United States by voting solidly for one party, as dictated by the papal hierarchy. The leaders of the clique to make doubly sure of their plan, control the national committee of both parties, through the national conventions, and now the true American has no choice with either of the old parties, but must vote for a man who owes his nomination to, or is absolutely subservient to the Ryan-Belmont-Sullivan-Murphy-O'Gorman-Gibbons-Plinn crowd."

Here the Catholic vote, which on the best authority amount to over 3,000,000 ballots is cut down to one-half its size, and this estimate is coupled with the ridiculous assertion that, small as it is it nevertheless controls the election of the president by being cast solidly for one party, as dictated by the papal hierarchy. The fact of it is, the Catholic vote is about evenly divided between the two great parties. Equally ridiculous is the contention that the leaders of this minority control the national conventions and committees of both political parties. The matter is uproariously absurd, and lacks even the ordinary ingenuity of a fabrication. It bears all the marks of a bald-faced lie, and will defeat its palpable object, which is to make votes from the ranks of the great political parties for the Socialist ticket.

The prediction ascribed to Abraham Lincoln, portending a calamity in this country through the influence of the Catholic Church, is a fabrication pure and simple. Publication of such infamous slander would serve the interests of the party which it is intended to denigrate. The prediction is a criminal act—much more so ought to stand against an organization representing fifteen millions of our population, each one of our population, each one of whom is misrepresented and maligned. In spite of the licentiousness advocated by Socialism it is opportune to have a censorship of publications enforced, which, while not interfering with the liberty of the press, would prevent such miserable campaign sheets as "The Great American Protest" from seeing the light of day.

In the next paragraph we are informed that Pope Pius X. said "Make America Catholic." But suppose he did. It was only a devout wish expressed that all Americans should be Christians. Would the Catholic voters of this country have taken any alarm at the moderator of the general assembly of the Presbyterian Church expressing the wish that all Americans should become Presbyterians, or at the presiding bishops of the general conference that they all should become members of the Methodist Episcopal Church? Why not be consistent and follow the golden rule? Is it after all not more a question of making Americans Christians than making them Catholics? And Catholics not only maintain, but undertake to prove to every unbiased mind, that they belong to the only true Church of Christ.

What follows in this paragraph is so superlatively ridiculous that its very folly invites reproduction: "Pope Pius X. says, 'Make America Catholic,' and he intends to do it, even if he has to try to slaughter every Protestant, Jew and Freethinker in the attempt. We say he must not; and by signing this great American protest is the use way for us to prove to him by ballots that he is outvoted, and is a helpless minority."

Ye gods! And this is a sample of the intelligence and fair-mindedness of American Socialists. Archbishop Quigley of Chicago is quoted as having said: "We have well-ordered and efficient organizations, all at the beck and nod of the hierarchy and ready to do what the church authorities tell them to do. With these bodies of loyal Catholics ready to step into the breach at any time and present an unbroken front to the enemy we may feel secure."

Yet the Archbishop was speaking to the subject of spiritual power and efficacy as represented by those religious societies—not in the least referring to any temporal or secular influence and domination which they might exercise. How damnable perverting the Socialist party had become!

Next the vile campaign sheet attacks President Taft for having appointed Judge White, a Catholic and a Democrat, to be chief justice of the United States, insinuating that the appointment was made, not because White was the best qualified, but because he was a Romanist. Such rot would provoke a smile, even from a well-informed Socialist. Again Taft is criticized because on Thanksgiving day he attended divine worship at St. Patrick's Catholic Church. It's a wonder he is not described as having seen horns growing out of the officiating priest's head.

But Wilson, the Democratic nominee for President comes in for his share of attack. He is condemned because he signed the law prohibiting justices of the peace from performing the marriage ceremony in the state of New Jersey—a law which it is claimed "was originated and pushed by the Romanists." Then this contemptible "wipe" attacks the Republican convention because it was opened with prayer by Father O'Callaghan, and the Democratic

convention because its sessions were opened by an invocation pronounced by Cardinal Gibbons. And the Cardinal is denounced because he is opposed to the recall of judges and judicial decisions and other debatable measures. Speaker Clark comes in for his share of anathemas for having praised Cardinal Gibbons and ex-Speaker Cannon, and America's two grand old men, and "classified the discovery of America as the greatest event in the world's history." Why should they not endeavor to expunge the name of Columbus from the pages of history?

And after all this vituperation, which we intend to show them they see fit, but from the above it is plain that they are asking special legislation in this country for Romanists, even those who live in foreign countries, and who only make up one-seventh of our population, and over half of that seventh is the illiterate foreigner just arrived from southern Europe and not even citizens. And they intend to do this by making laws by making the politicians believe that they are the balance of power in all elections. We must prove otherwise."

Here the hideous lead of nativism comes up from the grave once more. But the milk in the cocoanut appears in the last paragraph, which gives the wording of the pledge, which every signer of the "Great American Protest" is called upon to endorse: "Believing the matter set forth in the Great American Protest to be true and to be the gravest danger American has ever had to face, I hereby sign my name and pledge myself to vote at the coming national election, November 5, 1912, for the Socialist party for president, vice president and congress, the only party absolutely free from Romish influences and domination."

Further, this being a movement of the people, without the support of any money power, I herewith donate the amount set opposite my name, to aid in the successful prosecution of this campaign, in printing and mailing literature and any other lawful means."

At last the cat is let out of the bag—and the cat's name is the Socialist party, and the cat's paws are the wretched contingent of dopes misled by revamped lies of Know-nothingism and A. P. A.ism. It is doubtful whether Socialism will profit by its latest scheme of chicanery and fraud. One thing is certain—its unmasking will prevent many a hesitating Catholic from penetrating farther into its poisoned atmosphere and may be the means of bringing stray sheep back into the fold of the Catholic Church. It is a disgrace to the true rights of workingmen and upholds the proper relation between the individual and the community.—Intermountain Catholic.

BELFAST REIGN OF TERROR

In the House of Commons Mr. Joseph Devlin has described the "reign of terror" in Belfast, in which the actors have been Orangemen and the victims Catholic workers in the ship-building industry. He has taken up the case of being Home Ruler, or sympathizer with Home Rule. Here are some of the facts given by Mr. Devlin in his speech, noted in The Irish World recently:

"It is estimated there are over two thousand Catholics and some five hundred Protestants, representing at least twelve thousand people, in the City of Belfast. The Catholics are being employed owing to the reign of terror which exists there. They claim to work. They are ready to work. There is work for them to do, and they are not permitted to work. Not only that, but within the area of their employment, they are beaten and maltreated, and some of them killed, and when some of them try to show their assent, at the close of the evening—those who have engaged in a hard and laborious day's occupation—they are hounded down and followed and hunted over the public roads—followed, in some cases, into tramcars, and the tramcars have been wrecked."

"The men who have been doing these things for some time past belong to the party which claims to represent 'civil and religious liberty,' and objects to Home Rule on the alleged ground that it would mean 'persecution of Protestants.' But it is not the ruffians of the streets and the shippers who are responsible for this 'reign of terror' in Belfast. The real culprits are 'higher up,' as Mr. Jeremiah MacVeagh thus emphasizes in an article in the Freeman 'Fixing the Responsibility': 'With whom does the responsibility for these horrid happenings rest? To what agencies do we owe this degrading recrudescence of tumult and anarchy in a city which, as past history shows, is afflicted with more than its fair share of rowdiness and hoodlumism? Is it with the ignorant and unthinking mob, or is it with the more or less responsible public men who willfully goad them to deeds of lawlessness and crime? Surely, the answer must be that the blame rests upon the shoulders of men like Sir Edward Carson, who openly preaches the doctrine of 'breaking every law that can be broken,' and Mr. Bonar Law, who promises to encourage and support the law-breakers in every step they may decide to take.' That is the true fixing of the responsibility. And the 'unmistakable' may be taken as a sample of the 'civil war' against Home Rule. Rowdiness in the streets of Belfast will be the full extent of the Orange 'war,' if there be any such at all, and needless to say, in the event of any such, the Irish National Government will be able to deal with it speedily and effectively."

CONCERNING HYPNOTISM

The word Hypnotism is derived from the Greek word "hypnos," meaning sleep, and for many years past the remarkable effects that can be produced in the human object, by means of this common enough practice, have attracted much attention. Two very different classes of people are interested in it (writes Father G. Hughes in a Catholic Truth publication), namely, those who are interested in its marvels, and scientific men who expect that it may be an aid to science. It is, we are told, related to mesmerism and owes its origin as a practice to mesmeric phenomena.

Of its nature, it attracted the attention of the moralist, and so came under the notice of the Church, which found it necessary to decide whether it was right or wrong to indulge in the practice of hypnotism. Is it right that curiosity-seekers should look upon an amusement the placing of their fellow-creatures in a condition of hypnos—or unnatural sleep? Are the medical men justified in using hypnotism, and does physiological science reap any benefits therefrom?

Since most people know of the general degradation of hypnotic seances, it is not necessary to describe one. It is sufficient, knowing what we know of the much-advertised performances in which men and women are made to perform the most strange and objectionable tactics, to consider what the Church teaches regarding the practice and how she has pronounced upon the matter. We must look, says Father Hughes, to the moral theologians, and rely, if further instruction be required, on the educated Catholic conscience.

The Church is very careful, says Father Hughes, not to condemn any thing outright, merely because it is new or unaccustomed, or apparently marvelous. Nor will she condemn a thing which, though good in itself, is liable to abuse, or has been abused. She will condemn the abuse and leave the good untouched. Consequently the question "Is Hypnotism right or wrong?" cannot be answered by a simple "yes" or "no."

When first called upon to give guidance to Catholics on the question of hypnotism—or, as it was termed, mesmerism or magnetism, the Holy See (speaking through one of the Sacred Congregations) laid down what we may call the first rule of Catholics in the matter. The Sacred Congregation condemned all superstitious use of "animal magnetism," though they abstained from a total condemnation of the practice in itself apart from superstitious uses.

"It has been found," wrote the Congregation of the Holy Inquisition in 1856, "that a new kind of superstition has been introduced on occasion of magnetic phenomena by many lovers of novelties; not to throw light on physical science—which would be good—but to deceive and seduce men, thinking that by the magnetic art, they can discover things hidden, distant or future. The malice of men has so increased that neglecting the laws of science, they boast of having found a means of fortune-telling and divination."

If effects like these were actually obtained says Father Hughes, they could only be attributed to some preternatural—that is, diabolical—agency, and the practice of such arts must plainly be sinful.

The Holy See has condemned all superstitious use of hypnotism: all application of physical means that are otherwise unlawful or forbidden, and all use of magnetism or hypnotism for unlawful ends or objects. Not only (says Father Hughes) as a matter of obedience, but as a matter of reason, every Catholic will subscribe to these prohibitions. As Doctor Samuel Johnson, the Lexicographer, said: "No one who reads the New Testament can disbelieve the fact that the fallen angels do exercise a malevolent influence over man."

That there are intelligences of a far higher order than our own, we know, says Father Hughes, and there is nothing impossible in supposing that they can, and do, take occasion from men's experimenting with certain little-known forces, which in themselves are natural, to get into connection with human beings and to deceive and influence them by the introduction of their own diabolical operations into such experiments.

The hypnotic or mesmeric state may sometimes offer them an occasion of this sort, like the planchette or "medium" of spiritualistic seances. The terrible dangers of such communications, however they be brought about, cannot be exaggerated. It is, then, the abuse of Hypnotism that has been condemned, not the practice itself, with a lawful end in view. Father Leckmuhl, S. J., an authority on this subject, concludes that there must be some grave reason for submitting to hypnosis, to make it morally permissible that a person should do so. As to the character of the operator in such cases, for obvious reasons it is necessary that he should possess a skilled and unimpeachable character, that reliable witnesses should be present and that it should be ascertained for certain that the constitutional disposition of the subject is not such as to make it likely that any permanent harm to the system might ensue. Scientific men of the medical profession claim to have established beyond a doubt the efficacy of hypnotic treatment as a curative agent, and that too, in cases which were proved to be otherwise incurable. Several hundreds of cases have been credibly attested by Father Leckmuhl, and it is not seriously denied that the art can be used with success, as in the case of drunkenness and drug habits as well as in defects of the character. Nevertheless, it is certain that "save in the hands of duly qualified operators,

and very few can attain to that position, attempts at hypnotism are nothing short of criminal, as necessarily involving a terrible disturbance of the whole nervous system—a disturbance which may extend to all the faculties" (a writer in The Month).

An especial point is made, in regard to the question, by Father Genicot, also a Jesuit, who asks how far those who, being in the hypnotic state, or acting later upon the suggestions received when in that state carry out the commands of the hypnotizer are responsible for their actions. * * * It appears, he suggests, that sometimes the use of reason is totally suspended. Doctors, he says, are still at variance as to the possibility of suggesting crime, and some writers assert that through a hypnotized subject may be persuaded to do many ridiculous and extraordinary and even unpleasant things, he will stop at anything opposed to his idea of moral rectitude.

Hypnotism is (as Father Hughes says) a two-edged sword, to be wielded only by those whom he wishes to benefit. As to public exhibitions of hypnotism, given by wholly irresponsible charlatans for the sake of making money, the Christian conscience may securely be appealed to. Most decidedly such a thing is wrong, says Father Hughes. It cannot be right that rational beings should put themselves entirely into the power of another for the sake of amusing a curious crowd with their ridiculous performance. It can be right that the delicate machinery of the nerves and brain should be rarely played upon by operators who have no knowledge of its intricacies, and who are incapable of repairing the harm they do.—N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

THE "NE TEMERE"

ANGLICAN CLERGYMAN TAKES SENSIBLE VIEW OF THE SUBJECT

It is worth the while of Anglicans to trouble themselves about this Roman decree? In the first place it is only the putting in force of the decree of Trent on marriage, throughout the United States. These decrees were already in force in Baltimore, St. Louis, and New Orleans, and no one I think, has ever noticed any appreciable difference between these dioceses and the other Roman dioceses as to the rights of Anglicans in mixed marriages.

In the next place the decree does not, cannot, touch the question of the legal validity of any marriage mixed or other. It is only of force in the spiritual, or sacramental order. A Roman decree of any sort cannot possibly affect American status, or law, whether it effects marriage or anything else. Of course it affects its own people in the spiritual sphere. But what have we to do with that? Are we so sorely concerned about any of our people who may unwisely consent in wedlock with a Catholic, as to demand that Rome be enjoined by law from casting any slur upon such marriages? None! Rome has all along denied their sacramental validity, even when performed by her own ministers. She never gives them benediction, nor are they celebrated before the altar. But then, I imagine, those persons who are waxing hot over a matter of internal discipline in the Roman Church are not greatly concerned about the denial of the sacramental nature of mixed marriages. They do not admit, I presume, the sacramental character of any marriage.

Rome is altogether right in seeking to prevent the evil of mixed marriages. Would that we were half as faithful to our trust? We do not hesitate to wed our young women to any sort of believer or unbeliever; even to pronounce the nuptial blessing before the altar upon marriages which God does not bless. We require men to say, "With this ring I thee wed. . . in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," when we know they do not believe in Father, Son, or Holy Ghost. Our women, or many of them, run far more risk in their marriage with unbelievers by their own pastors, than any of them run in wedding Catholics. Yet it would be better for them, and for their children, not to enter into a mixed marriage at all.—John Williams in the Living Church.

A POINTER FOR THE "GUARDIANS OF BIGOTRY"

Charles J. Bonaparte loses no opportunity of impressing the American public with one self-evident fact—that a good Catholic must be a good citizen. Owing to the misrepresentations of intolerant zealots, the notion is yet widespread that a thoroughly orthodox Catholic must be a traitor to his country. Mr. Bonaparte disposes of this charge very effectively by stating: "There is one argument against the Catholic Church—or, at least, one outcry doing duty as an argument—which merits a passing word, if for no other reason, because of its antiquity. Pilo was told that his Priscus would make Himself King of the Jews; we are sometimes told to-day that the Churches aspire to temporal dominion. He asked for and heard the truth, and declared the charge groundless; yet he feared the cry: 'If thou release this Man, thou art no friend of Caesar.' There have been some men in public life among us as consciously unjust when they covered before the like clamor. On this subject let us ask but two questions: Were those men who thus drove Pilate to shed innocent blood—were they, in truth—'friends of Caesar?' If anyone who, in our day and country, would prescribe men for their faith and stir anew the dying embers of sectarian hatred—is such a man; in truth, a friend to American liberty?"—True Voice.

CATHOLIC NOTES

A civil list pension of \$350 has been granted to the late Justin McCarthy's daughter, Charlotte, on account of her father's services to literature.

Four Franciscan monks from English monasteries have been appointed as missionaries by the Pope to go to the Putumayo rubber district of Peru, where natives were tortured.

"We understand," says the London Tablet, "that it has been decided to establish a foundation of the Redemptorist order in South Africa. Negotiations have been taking place in regard to a suitable site for commencement of the work in Pretoria."

Father Jose Algue, Director of the Philippine Weather Bureau, has a device for detecting typhoons that has been adopted by the United States Government. He has warned people on land and sea of the approach of storms for the past twenty years.

At the Vienna Eucharistic Congress on September 10 it is expected that ten Cardinals, 17,000 priests, the whole Austro-Hungarian Episcopate, and fully 200,000 persons in procession, will participate. It is estimated that 2,000 Americans will also take part in it.

There are now 65 chaplains of the United States Army, of whom 14 are Catholics, 14 Episcopalians, 7 Presbyterians, 7 Methodists, 6 Baptists, 3 Congregationalists, 3 Methodists, 2 Unitarians, 2 African Methodists, 2 Lutherans, 1 Christian, 1 United Brethren, and 1 colored Baptist.

Archbishop Patrick W. Riordan, of San Francisco, has issued a letter to all the pastors of his diocese in which he requests that the women of the Catholic Church exercise their right of suffrage. The Archbishop bases his recommendation on the ground that to vote is a civic duty imposed upon them by the State.

The King of Saxony, Frederick August, is a Catholic. His brother, Prince Max, is a distinguished priest. The King occupies the somewhat unusual position of being a Catholic ruler over a Protestant land. Out of a population of about 3,000,000 only about 80,000 are Catholics.

Steps are now being taken for the beatification of Nano Nagle, the saintly foundress of the Order of Presentation Nuns. Her work has been attended with the most extraordinary success. In scores of places in Ireland, America, Asia and Australia Presentation Convents arose to be founded.

Right Rev. Bishop Maes, of Covington, Ky., was a prominent figure at the great International Eucharistic Congress held in Vienna, the Austrian capital, last week, beginning Tuesday and concluding with the procession in which the aged Emperor-King, Francis Joseph rode as a testimony to his faith in the Mystery of the Altar.

At Le Puy, France, on the 22 ult., began the trial of forty Christian Brothers accused of living together in community as religious and occupying their former house purchased at Government auction by a lady who gave them re-possession of it. The lady also has been indicted and is on trial for this.

At the close of the annual retreat of the Oblate Fathers in Winnipeg recently the Rev. Joseph McCarthy celebrated the fifteenth anniversary of the taking of his solemn vows of the Oblate Order. He officiated at Solemn High Mass in St. Mary's, to which he was the first pastor, and the sermon preached by the Most Reverend Archbishop Langvein.

The narrow skirt has just been put under the ban by Cardinal Cavallari, patriarch of Venice and successor in that position to Pope Pius X. Along with the narrow skirt he has also decreed against practically every expression of feminine fashion from the strongly into evidence the list of peck-a-bow waists, low-necked blouses, bobble skirts, mystic-mace stockings, and scanty attire in general.

Here is an extract from the Diocesan Statutes of Kansas City, Mo., of which the Right Rev. Thos. F. Lillis, D. D., is Bishop: "Both clergy and laity are urged to discourage by every means in their power the extravagance, vain display, and worldly spirit in funerals. Any funeral, that costs more than 20 per cent. of the annual revenue of the family, may fairly be called extravagant."

Sometimes even the most inveterate enemy pays tribute, albeit unwittingly, to the Catholic Church. The discussion which has arisen in Germany on the decline of the birth rate has brought strongly into evidence the different statistics of births in the Protestant and Catholic portions of the country. The Tagliche Rundschau, the organ of the Lutheran Evangelicals, remarks naively that it is an extraordinary fact that in the Catholic portions of the Fatherland the birth rate is normal, while it is in the Protestant parts that it has fallen off very considerably.

A magnificent educational city of 2,000 dwellers will rise within the next two years says the Missionary, at Brookland, District of Columbia, the importance and influence of which will in time be more far-reaching than any single enterprise ever conceived by the Catholic Church in this country. One hundred buildings will be included in this little cloistered city, whose environs will cover fifty-seven acres. The purpose of these buildings will be to shelter and provide facilities for educating a small army of earnest women seeking the highest training the age affords, and to carry back to their various communities a knowledge of the latest developments in science and teaching. The construction of this project will cost more than \$1,000,000; its benefits to the Church cannot be measured by dollars and cents.