

MARCH 10, 1894.

AN APPEAL TO OUR "ORTHODOX" FRIENDS.

In spite of the general trend of Protestantism in the direction of free-thought and liberal, rationalistic ideas we believe there is a very fair proportion of the so-called Orthodox denominations who still cling to the traditional teaching of the Church on the great fundamental doctrines of Christianity. They firmly believe in the supernatural character of the religion of the Bible—the great central doctrines of the Incarnation, the divinity of Christ, and His atonement, the necessity of faith in Him as a divine Saviour, of repentance for sin, of a true conversion of heart and life in order to attain the salvation of our souls, which is the great end of our creation and the only supreme and all-important business of life while we remain in this world.

The Westminster Catechism of our Presbyterian friends very well expresses it in the answer to the first question: "What is the chief end of man?" Answer—"Man's chief end is to glorify God and enjoy Him forever." That is a brief, comprehensive and very pertinent statement. To be a true Christian is to seek first the kingdom of God and His justice and not the fleeting pleasures and unsubstantial goods of this life. It is to lay up treasures in heaven and not on earth. The true Christian is in the world but not of it. He is diligent in business like other people and he may be prosperous and accumulate property by honest, upright dealing, but his heart is not in it. He does not love the world for its own sake, he is only anxious to use all his gifts and blessings to the glory of God and the good of his fellow-creatures. We have been thus particular in describing what we believe are still the views of our Orthodox friends to accentuate the importance of religious education. It is clear, taking human nature as we find it, that the making of true Christians according to the pattern we have endeavored briefly to sketch is not to be the work of a day, nor the result of an intermittent, half-and-half, milk-and-water system of instruction. Religion must be made the supreme part of the child's life. Its roots must be thoroughly imbedded even from infancy with the principles and spirit of the religion of Jesus Christ. We cannot conceive of a more dangerous, suicidal policy than that of confining the child during the whole course of his education to a system of purely secular instruction and influence.

The idea that the deficiency can be made up by an hour's Sunday school instruction during the week is a delusion and a snare. There are, perhaps, a few families in which the religious influence is so predominant, so constant, consistent and all-prevailing and where the intelligent and well-informed parents make it so much a matter of conscientious duty to see that their children are thoroughly instructed in their religion, that the deleterious influences of secular schools may be in a measure lessened, but always at more or less risk.

And what a strange idea that Christians should be under the necessity of contending against the evil influences of a system of secular education when duty, and expediency, and common sense, and Christian principles would dictate the imperative necessity of having a system which instead of reacting against the system which they guard against its damaging influences, should work in harmony with their views and efforts and not only supplement but anticipate those efforts and complete the important work!

The best religious—the most thorough Christian—school is little enough to form the character on the true Christian model. If the best Christian training is not always successful in counteracting the evil propensities of human nature and forming the character on the divine model furnished us in Holy Scripture, what shall we think of the system that shuts out religious teaching and religious influence entirely? There is an important truth in the declaration that children must be trained in a religious atmosphere, surrounded by all the influences that can be brought to bear upon them to develop their moral and religious nature, to train their consciences and form in them permanent habits of acting from high moral principle, from the love of God and supreme devotion to duty.

Now we are perfectly aware that all really good, devout Protestants assent to the views here expressed. In their hearts they know that a system of secular education is unreasonable, unwise, and Christian and dangerous. Individuals and religious bodies have occasionally given utterance in the strongest terms to these views of the importance of a thorough religious and Christian education for their children. Yet they take no pains to establish such a system and in fact continue to glorify the secular, public school system which in their hearts they know and believe to be injurious, and in fact inconsistent with their own principles.

Why do they pursue such an unwise, inconsistent and suicidal course? Partly from the lingering influence of an old, hereditary prejudice, but principally from a feeling compelled to yield to the clamor of a lot of ignorant, unreasoning, hard-braided bigots who profess to be afraid that Catholics are going to over-run the country and take possession of the Government and rule them all with a rod of iron.

Now aside from the folly of supposing there is any danger of eight or ten millions of Catholics getting possession of the Government in opposition to fifty or sixty millions of non-Catholics why cannot our friends see that their

unseemly and unfounded fears are simply a manifest and childish confession of weakness. Why can they not see that the very best way to stem the advancing tide of Catholicity at which they profess to be so alarmed would be for all to go to work and get up religious schools, each according to their own views, and make the people all good Protestants? Why can they not see that they are playing into the hands of Infidels, sceptics and agnostics?

Why should they object to Catholics giving their children the very best religious education in their power? Protestants themselves acknowledge that the Catholic religion has a powerfully restraining influence upon the masses. It has a tendency to make them good, moral citizens, whereas the teaching of the secular system of the Public Schools has a direct and inevitable tendency to destroy in their minds all reverence for religion of any kind. If you could wean all the Catholic children from their own religion you would not make them religious Protestants but sceptics and infidels. Why should you wish to do that? Is it fair, is it manly, is it a wise proceeding? Above all, is it Christian? We think not, and we acknowledge that we are not only surprised but exceedingly pained and saddened at the thought that our friends and neighbors with whom we have the most pleasant and friendly business and social relations should feel it necessary to do us an injustice at the same time that they sacrifice their own best interests and the interests of the rising generation to the demands of an old traditional prejudice which is as false and unfounded as it is absurd and ridiculous. Dear friends, you who believe in and love the religion of Jesus Christ and still exercise a controlling influence, for God's sake and for the sake of the best interests of our children and the prosperity of our beloved country, let us come to some understanding by which we can all give to the rising generation that thorough religious training which is so essential to good citizenship as well as to the salvation of their souls.—N. Y. Catholic Review.

THE ENGLISH CHURCH ALWAYS ROMAN CATHOLIC.

Tract of the Catholic Truth Society.

It is a favorite plan of some who care little for the truth of history, to state boldly, but without proof, that the Church of England never was Roman Catholic and never acknowledged the Pope to be the head of the Church. I hope Pope to be the head of the Church, in this paper, that the Church of England before the Reformation always did acknowledge the Pope to be the Head of the Church, and therefore always was, up to that time, Roman Catholic.

The great historian of the early English Church is the Venerable Bede, who died in the year 735. Speaking of Pope Gregory he says, that "we may and ought rightly to call him our Apostle, because, whereas he bore the Pontifical power all over the world, and was placed over the Churches already reduced to the faith of truth, he made our nation, all then given up to idols, the Church of Christ." For it was this Pope Gregory who sent St. Augustine into England to convert the English. When St. Augustine was succeeding in his work of conversion, he was, by the Pope's command, consecrated "Bishop of the English" by the Bishop of Arles, in France. Then Pope Gregory sent him several letters instructing him what he was to do in England. In one letter he tells him to ordain a number of Bishops who should be subject to him, and when York and the places around should receive the faith, he was to ordain one to be Archbishop. "But to you, my brother," the Pope writes, "shall, by the authority of our God and Lord Jesus Christ, be subject not only those Bishops you shall ordain, and those that shall be ordained by the Bishop of York, but also all the priests in Britain." In another letter he says: "With respect to the Bishops of Britain, we commit them all to your brotherhood, that the unlearned may be taught, and the obstinate be corrected by your authority." So all the Bishops in England, whether English or British, were subject to St. Augustine, and this by the authority of the Pope.

But Anglicans say, the British Church never admitted the Pope to be the Head of the Church, nor did the British Bishops submit to St. Augustine's authority. To this I answer: First, that it is not true to say that the British Church did not acknowledge the Pope to be the Head of the Church; Gildas, a British historian, says that the British held St. Peter to be "the first of the apostles," and key-bearer of the Kingdom of Heaven, through whom other Bishops received their power; we know also that British Bishops were present at the Council of Sardica, A. D. 437, which declared, in the letter sent to Pope Julius, that the Pope, that is, the Bishopric of Rome, is the Head of all Bishops. Secondly, even if this were true, it would not prove anything as regards the Church of England; for the British Church would have nothing whatever to do with the English, would not even help St. Augustine to convert them; therefore the Church of England cannot lay claim to any rights or privileges, not even to the Christian faith, through the British Church. Thirdly, though the British Bishops would not have St. Augustine to be their Archbishop, it was not because they despised the authority of the Pope, but because, as St. Augustine did not rise to greet them when they came to the place of meeting, they

judged that he was not meek and lowly of heart, and so would not agree to anything he proposed.

Those letters of Pope Gregory tell us also how England came to have Archbishops of Canterbury and York—they now hold a very different faith from that of St. Augustine and St. Paulinus, the first Archbishops—it was by the appointment of the Bishop of Rome, St. Augustine, too, was made by Pope Gregory Primate of England; and each successor of St. Augustine to the time of the Reformation, including Protestant Archbishops, received a fresh from the Pope of his time the authority which had been given to the first Archbishop of Canterbury. The sign of this authority was the pall, a kind of stole worn only by Archbishops, and every Archbishop, of Canterbury and of York had to go to Rome, after he was ordained, to receive his pall (unless unable to do so, when he could send for it), and could not use his power as Archbishop till he had received it. In Bede's History, and in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, a work of which even Dr. Giles, the Protestant critic, acknowledges the great authority, we are often told of an Archbishop going to Rome to receive his pall, or sending to Rome for it. Later on, at the personal request of King Canute when on a pilgrimage to Rome, leave was given that the English Archbishops might receive the pall without actually going to Rome for it. This receiving of the pall was a sign of their submission to the authority of the Pope.

For the first one hundred years after the coming of St. Augustine, the Bishops were Romans sent direct by the Pope. In 665 King Oswy, who, as Bede says (bk. iii. c. 29), "perfectly understood that the Roman was the Catholic and Apostolic Church," sent Wilfrid to Rome to be ordained Bishop. Wilfrid died in Rome, and Pope Vitalian "made diligent inquiry for some one to send to be Archbishop of the English Church" (Bede, bk. iv. c. 1). Theodore, whom he at last sent, was well received in England, and soon assembled a Council at Hertford (in which he called himself "the Bishop of the See of Canterbury appointed by the Apostolic See," that is, Rome); then he went about the country, visiting the churches and reforming what he thought to be wrong. He even deposed some of the Bishops; but one of them, Wilfrid, Archbishop of York, appealed to Rome, and was "by that authority acquitted of everything" and restored to his See, and Archbishop Theodore admitted this sentence. In 755 Pope Gregory III. placed all the Bishops north of the Humber under the authority of the Archbishop of York. In 787 the See of Lichfield was raised by Pope Adrian I. to an Archbishopric, but in 803 Pope Leo III. again placed it under the Archbishop of Canterbury.

All this is sufficient proof that the English Church, to the time of the Norman Conquest, acknowledged the Pope to be the Head of the Christian Church. Further proof is found in the constant pilgrimages to Rome, where a hospital was founded and supported by English money for the shelter of English pilgrims; in the charters and privileges asked for by Kings and granted by Popes; and in the Rome-secr or Peter pence, a tax paid to the Pope. The Venerable Bede says that "all those who in any way separate themselves from the unity of his faith and communion (that is, of St. Peter and of his successor, the Pope), can neither be absolved from the bond of their sins, nor enter the gate of the Heavenly Kingdom." From the time of the Norman Conquest, the evidence showing that England acknowledged the Pope as Head of the Church is so clear as scarcely to require proof for any one who has read even but a little of history.

That the Pope was Head of the Church was the teaching of St. Anselm of St. Thomas of Canterbury; of Cardinal Pullen, who taught at Oxford; of Bishop John of Salisbury; of St. Aelred, Abbot of Rievaulx; of Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln; of Roger Bacon; of Duns Scotus; of the great English theologian, Thomas Waldensis; and of a host of others. We will give the words of one later writer, King Henry VIII. In his book on the Seven Sacraments which he wrote against Luther, in defence of the Roman Catholic Church, he says: "It cannot be denied that the whole Church of the faithful recognizes the Holy Roman See as its mother and chief." In return for having written this book, Henry received from Pope Julius II. the title "Defender of the Faith," which is still part of the title of the Sovereign of England, and is inscribed (F. D.) on every piece of money.

But a few years later, as the Pope would not allow him a divorce from his wife, Henry determined to throw off the authority of the Pope; and he called upon the clergy, under threat of severe punishment, to acknowledge him as "head of the Church and clergy of England." This was at first resisted by the clergy; and Bishop Fisher in his speech to Convocation reminded them that by obeying the King they would render themselves "contemptible to the whole Christian world, and hissed out from the society of God's Holy Catholic Church;" to give this title to the King and make him, in place of the Pope, head of the Church of England, would be, he said, "contrary to Scripture and the Councils, would separate them from the unity of all Christians, and would cause them to be drowned in the wave of all heresies, sects, and schisms." In the end, the King's threats prevailed, and the clergy, except Fisher who was after-

wards beheaded, gave in "as far as the law of Christ will allow." But the laws then passed by the King ordering that Bishops should no longer be presented to the Pope for approval, and that all licences, etc., usually obtained from Rome, were now to cease, show clearly that the authority of the Pope had been up to that time (see Lingard, vol. vi. c. 111).

Once more—On January 21, 1559, the clergy of the Province of Canterbury presented to Queen Elizabeth a series of articles in defence of the Roman Catholic religion, of which the fourth states that to the successors of St. Peter (the Popes) "is given the supreme power of feeding and ruling the Church of Christ." And on the 27th of February, when it was proposed by the Queen's Ministers to declare the Queen to be head of the Church of England all the Bishops opposed it; and all, except Kitchen (called by Strype "the scourge of his diocese"), were soon after deposed, and then came Elizabeth's Protestant Bishops.

Many more proofs could be given, but those already given are more than sufficient to show that the Church of England was from the time of St. Augustine, her Apostle, to that of the Reformation, always Roman Catholic, and that she always acknowledged the Pope as her Head.

Against all this Anglicans say that the Pope usurped his authority, and that England protested against it. But there is no proof whatever that the Pope usurped his authority. I have shown how that authority came into England, and how the English, both clergy and people, submitted to it. Moreover, when did England ever submit without resistance to usurped authority? Anglicans say that the English protested against the Pope; they did nothing of the kind. It is quite true that a few kings tried to protest against Rome, in order that they might bring the clergy and the wealth of the Church under their own power, but such acts of injustice were always resisted by fresh appeals to the Pope, nor can they be called protests. There was one, and one only, protest against the spiritual authority of the Pope. This was made by Wiclif; and Wiclif's article that "the Roman Church was not supreme amongst the Churches" was condemned in London A. D. 1411, by fourteen Bishops and thirty doctors of theology.

Reader, take the advice of Alcinou, one of the greatest lights of the old Church of England, and that you "be not found to be a schismatic or non-Catholic. Follow the most trustworthy authority of the Roman Church."

ARE THEY FORGOTTEN WHEN THEY'RE GONE?

Why are Deceased Priests Not Offered Masses for by their Congregations?

The present Bishop of Cleveland, Right Rev. Dr. Horstmann, in a funeral sermon lately delivered in this city, asked the question, why are priests so soon forgotten after death? He did not mean that the priest's names or works were forgotten. Indeed, the contrary was the case; so much that the churches they labored to build and the parishes they helped to organize are known even yet by the family names of their founders. What he referred to was the deplorable fact that so few people continued to pray for or had Masses offered for the souls of their deceased pastors.

The truth of this general and grave charge against the gratitude of the Catholic laity is not seriously questioned. There are, doubtless, many and worthy exceptions, but it is an old and generally admitted fact that no class of men fades from the memory quicker than our priests, and that even the most popular amongst them is very soon forgotten after death. The priests themselves know it and admit it.

We knew a clergyman who died some years ago in a parish where he had lived for over twenty years; he was a model priest in every respect; he was beloved by all, both old and young; his name was a household one with the rich and poor alike; yet we were assured by his successor that, during the year immediately following his death, only one person in the congregation had a Mass offered for the repose of his soul. Not a great while ago another very devoted priest died in the diocese. His death was justly mourned by his flock, for he had spent his life and his talent and his means in building and adorning their church, and in every zealous way helping them in their spiritual and temporal necessities. The day of his burial was a day of general weeping and heart-rending sorrow. On the occasion of his Month's Mind, however, we heard from one of the priests of the Church that, during the month since his death, only one person asked him to say Mass for the deceased pastor. And how few, comparatively, attend the Month's Memory services. This seems to be the general experience, an experience as unaccountable as it appears to be unjust; for certainly of all persons we know, the priest who is our spiritual father and guide, has the most lasting claims on our gratitude and charity.

The Bishop's explanation or excuse for this neglect of the laity to remember their deceased pastors was, if not quite satisfactory, at least very good. He thought the neglect arose from the fact that most Catholics believed that the priest did not need any Masses or prayers. The priest's mind was supposed to be devoted to the teachings of religion and his time spent among the things of God. As he had to celebrate the Holy mysteries nearly every day

and administer the sacraments at all times, and as in order to do this his soul was expected to be always in the state of grace, they, therefore, believed that his punishment in purgatory would be little or nothing, and as a consequence very soon omitted to pray for him. This plausible explanation may be very complimentary to the life of the priest, but it is very cruel in its practical consequences. In the first place, as men and not angels are the ministers of the Gospel, priests are human and therefore liable to human imperfections. Their works may be imperfect; they may have been built on the foundation, as St. Paul says, of gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble, which in burning shall suffer loss; but they themselves shall be saved yet so as by fire. In the second place, this excuse takes no account of the responsibilities of the priest; the many graces he received both in his vocation and sacred office, the duties he has to discharge, the charge of souls committed to his care, the account he shall give to the Great Judge for duties neglected as well as for the manner in which others were performed. All these and many more are included in the responsibility of a priestly vocation, and consequently it would be cruel to their memory to deprive them of the prayers and suffrages of the Church, under the perhaps false supposition that because they were selected for the sanctuary they owed no debt to the justice of God.

Another reason might be given for this forgetfulness of our deceased priests. It comes from the belief that the priest belongs to no particular person on earth, but belongs to God alone! When yet a youth he feels the voice of our Lord calling on him to leave all things and follow Him. Obeying that voice, he leaves home and friends, even his father and mother. He enters the Seminary, his education tends to cool, to lessen, to spiritualize all his human and family affections, he is selected, like Saul, for a special work, he is ordained, he goes on the mission, and while all the flock claim him and consult him and trouble him as he please, yet he is ever that peculiar, unique character—the Catholic priest—claimed by all and still belonging to no one. Consequently, when he dies, he runs the risk of being forgotten or neglected on the principle that what is everybody's business is no one's concern, and the poor priest, after perhaps years of labor for a parish, may suffer in purgatory vainly expecting that at least his friends will have pity on him. Add to this the old saying, "out of sight out of mind," and you have another factor in the forgetfulness for priests. When we no longer see them, and they cease to be useful to us, they soon drop from our memory. "Three months dead, and not forgotten yet!" is the poet's way of telling a truth confirmed by time and experience.

And what we have said regarding our priests can be said of Catholics in general to a great extent. The living too readily forget the dead and show little gratitude and charity to them. Children even forget their parents, and in a few months after their decease, in many cases, remember them no longer. Their names may be recorded on a monument in the graveyard, but there is little done for the welfare of their souls.

Under such circumstances, and in this state of things, what seems to be the duty of priests and Catholics in general? Plainly to trust to no one, and to have provision made for themselves. This can be done in two ways; first, by helping every good work, when possible; helping religious and charitable institutions, assisting the poor and having Masses said while living. St. Leonard of Port Maurice urged his people to have Masses offered for themselves while living, teaching, what is a pious tradition among the good Irish people, that one Mass before

Here's a Pointer
When you ask for a 5 cent plug 10 cent plug 20 cent plug
DERBY PLUG Smoking Tobacco
be sure that the retailer does not induce you to buy any other in order that he may make a larger profit.
Ritchie & Co MONTREAL.

death is better than two after. Second, by providing in their wills that after their death the wants and charitable institutions of the Church shall be remembered, and that Masses shall be offered for the benefit of their souls. It shocks our faith to read of a rich man's will in which all his wealth is left to his friends, and not a penny to charity or offerings for Masses. On the other hand, when we see a Catholic—whether priest or layman—either by an insurance on his life or by a legitimate accumulation of money, make provision in his will that the Holy Sacrifice shall be repeatedly offered for him, we commend his faith and his prudence, and his care of his soul in laying up treasures for himself instead of trusting to the doubtful gratitude of either relatives or friends or other people.—Catholic Standard.



Pains in the Joints Caused by Inflammatory Swelling

A Perfect Cure by Hood's Sarsaparilla. It affords me much pleasure to recommend Hood's Sarsaparilla. My son was afflicted with great pain in the joints, accompanied with swelling so bad that he could not get up stairs to bed without crawling on hands and knees. I was very anxious about him, and having read Hood's Sarsaparilla Cures, so much about Hood's Sarsaparilla, I determined to try it, and got a half-dozen bottles, four of which entirely cured him." Mrs. G. A. LAKE, Oshawa, Ontario.

BOOKS For the Season of Lent and Holy Week.

- Meditations for Holy Season of Lent... \$0.50
Lenten Conferences, 2 vols... 2.00
Love of our Lord... 1.00
The Dolorous Passion... 1.00
The Sufferings of Our Lord... 1.00
The soul on Calvary... 1.00
The Way of Salvation... 1.00
The Clock of the Passion... 1.00
Considerations on the Passion... 1.00
How to Live Piously... 1.00
Preparation for Death... 1.00

Month of March Books.

- Flower for Each Day of the Month of March... 50c
St. Joseph's Manual... 50c
The Power of St. Joseph... 50c
Devout Client of St. Joseph... 50c
The Month of St. Joseph... 50c
St. Joseph's Help... 50c
Novena to St. Patrick... 20c

Real Pains for Palm Sunday. Paschal Candles.

In the following sizes: 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12 and 15 lbs. either plain or decorated.
Just Issued.
The Catholic Directory and Ordo for 1894.
Paper, net price, per copy... \$1.25
The Annual Family Annual for 1894... 25c

D. & J. SADLER & CO. JOHN FERGUSON & SONS.

WEBSTER'S DICTIONARY -AND- The Catholic Record for One Year FOR \$4.00.
By special arrangement with the publishers, we are able to obtain a number of the above books, and propose to furnish a copy to each of our subscribers.
The dictionary is a necessity in every home, school and business house. It fills a vacancy, and furnishes knowledge which no one hundred other volumes of the choicest books could supply. Young and Old, Educated and Ignorant, Rich and Poor, all will find it within reach, and refer to its contents every day in the year.
As some have asked if this is really the Original Webster's Unabridged Dictionary, we are able to state that we have learned direct from the publishers the fact that this is the very work complete, on which about 40 of the best years of the author's life were so well employed in writing. It contains the entire vocabulary of the English language, including the correct spelling, derivation and definition of same, and is the regular standard size, containing about 300,000 square inches of printed surface, and is bound in cloth.
A whole library in itself. The regular selling price of Webster's Dictionary has heretofore been \$12.00.
N. B.—Dictionaries will be delivered free of all charge for carriage. All orders must be accompanied with the cash, or a check on the bank. If the book is not entirely satisfactory to the purchaser it may be returned at our expense.
I am well pleased with Webster's Unabridged Dictionary. I find it most valuable work. JOHN A. PAYNE, Chatham, Ont.
I am highly pleased with the Dictionary, writes Mr. W. Scott, of Lancaster, Ont. Address, THE CATHOLIC RECORD LONDON, ONT.

Quietly she has unwound the rosary from her wrist, and she bends down, placing her lips upon the crucifix—the crucifix given to her by the Cure of St. Anne, on the morning of her first Communion. "My God!" she murmurs, "the sacrifice is complete."

"O Dieu quem velatum nunc aspicio, Oro fiat illud quod tam cito in te revolvam certissime. Visu sim beatu te Glorice."

Then Mabel sinks her head very low; she will never lift it again in this world of sin and sorrow. It is all over for her. She has known what sorrow meant, but she will never know it any more. Short, too, has been the agony of that lonely death far away in the South Pacific Ocean! Short—oh, all so short compared with the endless ages of eternity!

A solemn hush falls upon the deck. The Captain has left his post and is praying aloud, surrounded by many of the passengers and crew. All violent weeping has completely ceased. Those who still remain helpless victims in the burning ship, have resigned themselves to their inevitable fate, and exult by a few gasping moans and sobs they forebear to show any manifestation of terror.

The last launched two boats and got clearly away—safely out of reach of the now quivering mass of fire to which the unfortunate vessel is reduced. About twenty minutes later, at a quarter to four o'clock, just as dawn is breaking in the Eastern sky, there comes a fearful crash, like the bursting of a thunder-bolt. A dazzling tongue of blue fire shoots upwards to the heavens, curling hither and thither like liquid lightning; the sky and sea for many miles round are illuminated as by a thousand bonfires. There rises upon the still morning air a long, piercing wail, after which there is death-like silence. Columns of smoke wreath upwards, and when they disperse again nought remains of the good ship Leander but a charred and broken wreck, floating in shivered fragments, upon the placid bosom of the great deep sea.

Once more the waters teem with a harvest of human life; struggling, drowning faces may be for a while distinguished, but it is all soon over. Life in this world has passed for ever, and more than two hundred souls have gone forth into life or death in the world to come.

Mabel was not one of those doomed to struggle in the waves. Suffocated with many others in the dense smoke, she died with comparatively little suffering. Sharp, indeed, had been the agony of the preceding hour—terrible the conflict ere she could resign herself to die, so near to Hugh, by so cruel a death; but from the moment when Katie was taken safely from her, it seemed as though the last link of the chain of Mabel's life, binding her to the cares of earth, was snapped asunder.

Intense, untroubled peace, the heirloom of God's faithful children, settled down upon her soul. In one short instant it was given to her to realize that which hitherto she had so often been forced to believe by faith only—namely, that God's holy will is at all times, in every season, and under every circumstance, has been, is, and must ever be, always for the best. Best of all in the hour of death and in the day of judgment.

Pacefully, like a weary child going to sleep on its mother's lap, Mabel had laid herself down in the Everlasting Arms, with her lips tightly fastened to the crucified image of her Saviour, so dear to her in life. She had met death quietly and without a struggle. It was no death for her. It was only the entrance into life eternal. She was spared the terrors of the last terrific explosion. God had taken her home full ten minutes before it took place. Happy, happy Mabel, what a blessed end for her! How gladly must her guardian angel have sung his Deo Gratias at that feast of St. Michael the Archangel.

TO BE CONTINUED.

The Voice of Manning.

When Cardinal Manning lay upon his death-bed, a photograph was introduced into the room, and he was asked to speak into it a message for posterity. The photograph has been carefully preserved by his successor, Cardinal Vaughan; and one day last week, as we learn from the Sunday Sun, the voice of the lamented Archbishop of Westminster was heard again upon the earth. The message ran as follows:

"To all who may come after me: I hope that no word of mine, written or spoken in my life, will be found to have done harm to any one after I am dead."

These touching, tender, humble words derive additional pathos from the fact that since the death of Cardinal Manning the poor and the oppressed the world over have longed to hear such helpful, comforting words as the voice now still forever was wont to utter. It was characteristic of the saintly Cardinal to think meanly of himself and his own work; but no one else could ever fancy that any word of his was likely to harm, instead of help.

The Spring Medicine

"All round" from the weakening effects of warm weather, you need a good tonic and blood purifier like Hood's Sarsaparilla. Do not put off taking it. Numerous little ailments, if neglected, will soon break up the system. Take Hood's Sarsaparilla now, to expel disease and give you strength and appetite.

Hood's Pills are the best family cathartic and liver medicine. Harmless, reliable, sure.

BURDOCK PILLS give satisfaction wherever tried. They cure Constipation, Sick Headache and Biliousness.