

DECEMBER 31, 1909.

our missionaries in the Philippine Islands are contradicted in official reports to the Government. Still do the prevailing parsons rage; they express no pity for the poor friars "cudgelled to death," or for the nuns "subjected to brutal treatment" by the fierce insurgents. It is a question in our mind whether the savages in the Philippines are more savage than some so-called ministers of the Gospel in these United States.—Ave Maria.

HE ANSWERS A BIGOT.

New York, Dec. 9.—Ex Mayor A. Oakley Hall, of New York, who died recently, was a convert to the Catholic faith. His conversion made him the victim of scurrilous attacks by mail and in print. Not long since he received a postal card which read:

"Well how do you like Popery so far as you have gone? The Spaniards put themselves under the protection of the Virgin. United States, of God. Which side shoots the best? Your Spanish brothers blindfolded a noble horse on Sunday and let a bull tear its entrails out to amuse them. Does that amuse you? If so keep on at Mariolatry, Romish puerility, tyranny and savagery."

The card was unsigned, but he recognized the hand as similar to that of a note received from an Episcopalian ex-clergyman, and he mailed to his cowardly correspondent the following reply:

Monsieur Thrope—To your unkind postal card I can only send you an echo from Calvary—"Father, forgive them for they know not what they do." You are ignorant. You do not know that Holy Church forbids bull fights and frowns upon those who participate in them. Also you do not know that the Spanish government is not affiliated with the Church as is the English government with its Protestant Church. In the Anglican Church in which you once officiated, and in all the Protestant sects, the word Mariolatry is used as a sneer to the veneration paid to the Virgin Mother of Christ by the Holy Catholic Roman Apostolic Church and as found in passages in the New Testament. Only bigotry could use the sneer word "Mariolatry," for if by the command on Mount Sinai man is to honor his own mother, how much deeper should be his honor to the Mother of his Redeemer.

You also sneeringly ask how I like my faith "so far as you have gone?" You will find my answer at the fourth verse of the Epistle of Pauline. And I take leave of you by suggesting that thou obeyest the injunction contained in the second chapter of Proverbs reading "apply thy heart to understanding."

GOD'S VICARS ON EARTH—ADAM TO LEO XIII.

As the year draws to a close it may not be unprofitable to point out that from the day God created Adam to the present He has had His vicars on earth. A learned writer has traced the succession from Adam to Leo XIII. He shows that the redemption of the world, having been accomplished, the Chair of Moses had to make way for the Chair of Peter, upon which the Saviour of the human race declared that He built up His Church in perpetuity and indestructibility. In the earliest, or antediluvian age, the line of Adam, the head of the world, and, as such, the Vicar of God, through the sons of Seth, became known, significantly, as the sons of God. In the postdiluvian age, Noah, previously distinguished as the preacher of righteousness, became recognized thenceforth as the supreme monarch, and as the original of the human race and of God's kingdom. His successor, Shem, otherwise Melchisedec, besides being ruler of Salem, was revered in his supreme sacerdotal capacity as the High Priest of God. From the first to the last the authoritative voice of earth since creation, through God's appointed Vicar, or representative. Under the Christian dispensation realities assumed the place of what, until then, had been alone prefigured.

The Empire Church that for forty centuries had been foreshadowed was, by the God Man, built up for ever from its foundations, those foundations being rooted upon the rock Simon Barjona, thenceforth Christened by our Lord Himself Cephas, or, in the Syro-Chaldaic, spoken by Him, Kipho, meaning rock or stone. Appointed by our Lord Himself the Sovereign Ruler and Governor of the whole flock, Peter—renewed in his successors down to his present holiness, Pope Leo XIII., to the number of 258—has for nineteen centuries been ruling the Church of God with a supreme and infallible authority. It was to Peter, and not to the other Apostles, that the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven were given, with the august intimation: "Whoever thou shalt bind upon earth shall be bound also in Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth shall be loosed also in Heaven." It was to St. Peter, and not to any other of the Apostles that our Lord uttered those wonderful words: "Behold, Satan has desired to have you that he may sift you as wheat; but I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not, and thou being once converted confirm thy brethren."

The principle of a succession of Vicars of God was introduced at the moment of man's creation. That principle of succession introduced then has for six thousand years been uninterruptedly maintained. It is traceable from the beginning until now.

Since the coming of our Lord Himself it has been visible to the whole world, from the time when the first Supreme Pontiff, St. Peter sat enthroned in the *sedes gestatoria* in the house of Pudens, to this present day, when Leo XIII. will spend Christmas a prisoner within the walls of the Vatican.—The American Herald.

DR. DE COSTA ON PROTESTANTISM.

Dr. De Costa, an Episcopalian minister of New York, made a fierce arraignment of Protestantism in his sermon last Sunday evening. He would not undertake to pronounce Protestantism a failure, but he said that it never was a success. When the English Reformers had finished their task, as they thought, it turned out that some two hundred additional reforms were required before all "superstition" was eliminated. Then it was discovered that the Bible needed overhauling. The "higher critics," as Dr. De Costa rather pointedly puts it, are the latest spawn of the "Blessed Reformation." He declared that the Reformation has unchurched some fifty millions of the people of our land and that no dependence is to be placed on the statements of sectarian statisticians, who cheerfully report that the denominations are "doing very well" in spite of the fact that irreligion is increasing by leaps and bounds. "The land is defiled by almost two hundred lymphatic, gelatinous, halting, doubting sects that are just beginning to become conscious of the fact that they have lost the masses of this country to religion." All sorts of devices have been tried to draw the people, but in vain, and everything points to the conclusion that non-Catholic Christian worship will rapidly decline. By way of contrast he points to the Roman Catholic Church which, as of old, keeps the even tenor of her way and maintains her hold upon her adherents without recourse to "attractions." Dr. De Costa remedies himself to diagnosis. As to remedies, he, a "humble priest," looks so far as his communion is concerned, to the right reverend fathers who are invested with the leadership and grave responsibility. He advocates, however, the unification of the "Churches."

This lively sermon of Dr. De Costa's has elicited an editorial pronouncement from the New York Sun, some of which is just the rest of which is merely smart. But before taking up that matter we say that the doctor's sermon contains little that is new. All that he has said about the failure of Protestantism was said years ago, and even more emphatically, in "Is Life Worth Living?" And what Mallock wrote fifteen years ago was said a quarter of a century before by Brownson. The fact is that no man who has mastered the principles of Protestantism can entertain any respect, affection or hope for it. Of it Brownson speaks as follows:

"It was a dissolvent but no harmonizer. It split by its everlasting protests, criticisms, and negatives the race into divisions, but had no power to reunite them and make them of one mind and one heart. As a religious institution it was a sham and no reality. It only disgusted men with the very name of religion, and drove every living man, every man of free thought and loving heart into doubt, infidelity, atheism, or chilled all his nobler feelings, rendered him indifferent to all elevated thought or generous and noble deeds, and forced him to engross himself in the pursuit of wealth or to seek dissipation in sensual pleasure."

But to go back to Dr. De Costa. As the Sun points out, it is odd to find him, a Protestant minister, inveighing against the system of which he himself is officially a champion. He has put himself in an extremely awkward position, and we shall not be surprised if he finds himself branded as a Jesuit in disguise. Other preachers before him have deplored the vagaries of the denominational system, but he goes to the root of the matter. The only consistent thing for him to do now is to give practical proof of the sincerity of his views. But, perhaps, consistency is hardly to be looked for in men of Dr. De Costa's position. Meanwhile it will be interesting to know on what grounds he can justify his adhesion to a system which, from his own standpoint, is more mischievous than the system which the leaders of the "Blessed Reformation" vainly tried to destroy. Dr. De Costa concluded his discourse by advocating the unification of the "Churches." He might as well talk about uniting the branches of a parabola. The editor of the Sun hits the nail on the head when he says that uniformity is not possible under Protestantism because the very theory thereof makes inevitable a variety of belief, skepticism, denial and change. Even so fundamental a point as the personality of Jesus Christ there is, incredible as it may seem, hopeless divergence. One by one the cardinal doctrines of historical Christianity have been weighed in the balance of private judgment and cast aside as unreasonable. Under the circumstances the only unification in sight is an agreement to disagree. Dr. De Costa is all right in his diagnosis, but his scheme of treatment betrays the quack.

Dr. De Costa said "Protestantism is passing, if not already dead. At least it is little more than a name." The editor of the Sun points to the controversy now going on in England between the sacerdotalists and their opponents in the Establishment as a refutation of the preacher's statement. One must distinguish between Protestantism as a system, and as a principle.

As a system it pretended to be a return to the truth and simplicity of primitive Christianity. In this sense Protestantism is little more than a memory. All that it had of religion is borrowed from the old Church, as Brownson says, and all that it had of its own was simply negation. The process of negation has progressed till nothing is left but some ethical principles to which still clings a little of the perfume of Christian sentiment. But Protestantism as a principle is by no means dead. Dr. De Costa has too keen an appreciation of its pernicious activity to warrant the supposition that he is speaking of it in this latter sense.—Providence Visitor.

STEWARDS OF GOD.

Duty of Rich to Poor Fully Recognized in Middle Ages.

Whilst fully recognizing as a fact that "the poor must always be with us"—that in the very nature of things there should ever be the class of those who "had" and the class of those who "had not"—our Catholic forefathers knew no such division and distinction between prosperity and poverty—or rather between the rich man and the poor man—as obtained later on when Protestant principles had asserted their supremacy and pauperism, as distinct from poverty, had come to be recognized as an inevitable consequence of the policy introduced with the Era. To the Christian moralist, and even to the Catholic Englishman, whether secular or lay, in the fifteenth century, those who had been blessed by God's providence with worldly wealth were regarded not so much as the fortunate possessors of personal riches, their own, to do with what they listed, and upon which none but they had right to claim, as in the light of trusted stewards of God's good gifts to mankind at large, for the right use and administration of which they were accountable to Him who gave them. Thus, to take an instance, the proceeds of ecclesiastical benefices were recognized in the Constitutions of Legates and Archbishops as being in fact as well as in theory the "elemosine," the "spes pauperum," the alms and the hope of the poor. Those ecclesiastics who consumed the revenues of their cures on other than necessary and fitting purposes were declared to be "defrauders of the rights of God's poor" and "thieves of Christian alms" intended for them; whilst the English canonists and legal professors who glossed these provisions of the Church law gravely discussed the ways in which the poor of a parish could vindicate their right—right, mind—to a share in the ecclesiastical funds of their Church. This "jus pauperum," which is set forth in such a text-book of English law as Lyndwood's "Provinciale," is naturally put forth more clearly and forcibly in a work intended for popular instruction, such as "Dives et Pauper": "To them that have the benefices and goods of Holy Church," writes the author, "it belongeth principally to give alms and to have the cure of the poor people." To him who squanders the alms of the altar on luxury and useless show the poor man may justly point and say: "It is ours that you so spend in pomp and vanity!"

What thou keepest for thyself of the altar passing thy honest, needful living, it is ravishing, it is theft, it is sacrilege." From the earliest days of English Christianity the care of the helpless poor was regarded as an obligation incumbent on all, and in 1342 Archbishop Stratford, dealing with "appropriations," or the assignment of ecclesiastical revenues to the support of some religious house or college, ordered that a portion of the tithe should always be set apart for the relief of the poor because, as Bishop Stubbs has pointed out, in England from the days of King Ethelred "a third part of the tithe" which belonged to the Church was the acknowledged birthright of the poorer members of Christ's flock. That there was social inequality goes without saying, for this is in the very constitution of human society, and may indeed be a very law of human nature. In feudal times this obvious truth passed unquestioned as the divine law of the universe, and with the overflow of the system in the thirteenth century there was created a chasm between the upper and lower classes which it was the interest of popular agitators and demagogues to widen and deepen. But even then, in theory at least, the claims of poverty were as fully recognized as the duty of riches.

The verses of "Piers Ploughman" and the "Canterbury Tales," and even the words of "the mad preacher" John Ball, are not more clear as to the existence of the social difficulties of those days, and of the claims put forward in the name of justice to common humanity, than the language of the great and fearless orator, Bishop Brunton, as to the religious obligations of Christian riches. Again and again in his sermons this great preacher reminds his hearers of the fact that poor and rich have alike descended from a common stock, and that, no matter what their condition of life may be, all Christians are members of one body and are bound one to the other by the duties of a common brotherhood. Still more definite is the teaching of the book of popular instructions—*Dives et Pauper*—above referred to. The sympathy of the writer is with the poor—as, indeed, is that of every ecclesiastical writer of the period. In fact, it is abundantly clear that the Church in England in Catholic days, as a *Pia Mater* was ever ready to open wide her heart to aid and protect the poorer members of Christ's Mystical Body. This is how "Pauper," in the tract in question, states the Christian teaching as to the duties of riches and impresses upon his

readers the view that the owners of worldly wealth are but stewards of the Lord: "All that the rich man hath, passing his honest living after the degree of his dispensation, it is other men's, not his, and he shall give hard reckoning thereof at the day of doom, when God shall say to him, 'Yield account of your bailywick.' For rich men and lords in this world are God's bailiffs and God's reeves to ordain for to the poor folk and to sustain them." Most strongly does the same writer insist that no property gives anyone the right to say "this is mine" and "that is thine," for property, so far as it is of God, is of the nature of "governance and dispensation," by which those by God's providence "have" act as His stewards and the dispensers of His gifts to such as "have not." The words of Pope Leo XIII. as to the Catholic teaching most accurately describe the practical doctrine of the English pre-Reformation Church on this matter. "The chiefest and most excellent rule for the right use of money," he says, "rests on the principle that it is one thing to have a right to the possession of money and another to have the right to use money as one pleases. 'How must one's possessions be used?' The Church replies without hesitation, 'in the words of St. Thomas: 'Man should not consider his outward possessions as his own, but as common to all, so as to share them without difficulty when others are in need.' When necessity has been supplied and one's position fairly considered, it is a duty to give to the indigent out of that which is over. It is a duty, not of justice (except in extreme cases), but of Christian charity."

(and) to sum up what has been said: Whoever has received from the Divine bounty a large share of blessings . . . has received them for the purpose of using them for the perfecting of his own nature, and at the same time that he may employ them, as the ministers of God's providence, for the benefit of others." There is no need to dwell more upon this point, as there can be no doubt as to the practical teaching of the Church in Catholic England on the subject of the duties of the "classes" to the "masses."—Dom Gasquet, in Liverpool Catholic Times.

THE WONDER-WORKER OF PADUA.

Traditions of the Great Saint in the City of His Predilection—St. Anthony's Shrine—His Miraculous Power.

(By Rev. Wm. McMahon.)

At the close of my last letter I promised to write more at length of the saint and the shrine of Padua. The devotion to St. Anthony is widespread, and, I am pleased to note, is still growing. The clients of the "Wonder-Worker" will be pleased to learn something more of the saint, and of the place that he selected for the scene of his principal labors, and which was consecrated by his sanctified death. I am glad to be able to write a few more lines from quaint old Padua, celebrated of yore for its university, and celebrated now for its shrine.

"Where are you from?" asked Leo XIII. of Don Locatelli.

"From Padua, Your Holiness."

"And do you love your saint?"

"Love him, Holy Father? Indeed, yes! I was born and bred in sight of his tomb, and I bear his name."

"Not only must you love him, but you must make him loved; for mark me well, St. Anthony is the saint not of Padua only, but of the whole world."

When St. Francis of Assisi was about fourteen years of age Anthony was born. Portugal was the birthplace of "the eldest son of St. Francis." On the 15th of August, 1195, Anthony was born at Lisbon. At his baptism he received the name of Fernando. His mother taught him devotion to the Blessed Virgin, and the first hymn the young boy sang, and his favorite afterwards, was "O Gloriosa Domina." Devotion to Mary became the keynote of his life. The serving of a priest at Mass was the happiest privilege that could be conferred upon him.

Having a divine vocation Fernando joined the Augustinians near Lisbon. He had always before him the saying of St. Jerome: "It will benefit naught to live in a holy place unless one lives there holily." Talented and studious he became well versed in history, the Sacred Scriptures, religious controversy and theology. Having been ordained priest, he was appointed guest-master in 1219. It was then that he first met the members of the new order established by St. Francis of Assisi. By permission he exchanged the white robe of the Augustinians for the habit of the Franciscans, and took the name of Anthony. When leaving the abbey one of the fathers said to him: "Go thy way; thou wilt surely become a saint." He gently replied: "My brother, when they tell thee I am a saint, bless thou the Lord."

He had no hesitation to declare that he, with God's help, intended to become a saint. All of us are called to "go up higher," but we fail to realize the call in action.

The ability and the talent and the learning of Anthony were not known. "The occasion makes the man." The expected preacher not being present at the ordination of priests Anthony was called upon. In his discourse he carried away his audience to the heights of mystic theology. The Bishop, the Dominicans, the Franciscans and all present were filled with wonder, and could not refrain from tears of emotion. They recognized in him an orator of the first rank, a master-mind and an apostle.

Anthony was at once placed on mis-

sonary work. He was of medium height, dark complexion, of a well-knit frame, and an expression of angelic sweetness. To full knowledge and natural eloquence were added divine inspiration and the gift of miracles. He confounded the heretics and brought back thousands to the sincere practice of religion. While preaching at Vercelli in Italy the body of a young man who had been cut off in the prime of life was brought to him amid wallings and lamentations. Anthony paused and prayed, and then with hand extended said in a tone of authority: "In the name of Christ, young man, arise!" Imagine the consternation of the people in witnessing a miracle similar to that over the widow's son at Naim. No wonder that no Church could contain the crowds that flocked to hear him. He spoke in the open air.

Pen and brush and monument here in Padua make many of the miracles of St. Anthony familiar to the people. Let me hastily and briefly relate some of them. With these are mingled prophecy.

A man of rather dissipated habits became enraged at St. Anthony for the marks of respect the monk persisted in showing him in the streets of Puy. "What is the meaning of all this nonsense?" he asked, in anger. St. Anthony replied: "I envy you the happiness in store for you. I longed to be a martyr. The Lord did not grant my desire. This grace is reserved for you. When the blessed hour comes be mindful of me." The man laughed. But he remembered the prediction a few years after, when on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land he proclaimed Mohammed an impostor, he suffered martyrdom at the hands of the Turks.

At Bourges he disputed with a Jew named Guillard. The Jew wanted a visible miracle before he would believe in the Real Presence. At the command of St. Anthony the Jew's mule knelt in the public square before the Blessed Sacrament in the monstrance held by the saint. Guillard and many others were converted and a monument commemorates the miracle.

A poor sinner overcome by grief could not find voice to confess his sins. "Go and write down your sins," said the saint, "and bring me the parchment." He returned with a long list all stained with tears. As he read out his sins they disappeared one by one from the page, until nothing was left but the spotless paper.

"My son is dead; have pity on a mother's tears," was the plaintive appeal made to St. Anthony. "Go back, my daughter," said the saint, "God has granted your prayers." She found the boy alive and well.

He scattered miracles as the sower scatters seed in the field.

The most popular representation of St. Anthony is Murillo's famous painting, "The Vision of St. Anthony." The original is not here, but is in the cathedral of Seville. One evening St. Anthony sought the hospitality of the Lord of Chateaufort. He prolonged his prayerful vigil far into the night. Suddenly he found himself surrounded by a supernatural brightness. Jesus, under the form of a little Child of marvellous beauty and grace, appeared to St. Anthony. The bliss of that hour as he pressed his heart against that of his Lord and felt its throbbing, the caresses would have excited the jealousy of the angels were they capable of envy. The master of the house, attracted by the wonderful lights, saw the vision. He had to promise not to reveal it during St. Anthony's life. From the time of that vision St. Anthony sought to show more and more that the Sacred Heart of Jesus "is the source of the supernatural life, the golden altar whereon burns day and night incense that rises in clouds of perfume towards heaven and embalms the earth."

St. Anthony journeyed to Rome. While preaching there on Easter Sunday, people of various tongues understood his sermon. Here we have the renewal of the miracle of the first Pentecost at Jerusalem.

I saw a representation of St. Anthony preaching to the fishes in the Adriatic. When the people had refused to listen, St. Anthony, inspired by Almighty God, preached to the fishes of the sea. He cried in loud voices: "Ye fishes of the rivers, ye fishes of the sea, listen unto me. It is I who have come to announce to you that I have come to announce the Word of God, since men have turned away from Him and refuse to listen." The people soon crowded to the shore and were converted by the miracle.

St. Anthony began his mission in Padua in 1229. At the request of the Bishop, he preached the Lenten course. Many miracles marked his presence. I have not space to enumerate them. The law courts were closed, business was suspended and labor interrupted to listen to St. Anthony. His audience often amounted to 3,000. The confessions were besieged and vice disappeared.

Father John Parenti, the general and a native of Florence, sent St. Anthony to that city to reconcile rival factions. He preached during Advent and Lent. In the funeral sermon over one of the wealthy and notable men, St. Anthony took for his text: "Where thy treasure is, there thy heart is also." In the midst of the sermon, he suddenly stopped and after a pause said slowly and solemnly: "This rich man is dead, and his soul is buried in hell. Go open his coffers and you will find his heart." It is related that his heart was found among the many gold pieces that he had accumulated by unjust exactions.

By choice and by permission St. Anthony chose Padua for the scene of

his labors. He proved its deliverer. St. Leo arrested Attila, "the scourge of God," when he was marching on to Rome. St. Anthony went forth to meet the armed tyrant Ezzelino and boldly addressed him: "How long, oh cruel tyrant, will you continue to shed innocent blood? The sword of the Lord is suspended over your head, and terrible will be His judgment upon you."

The attendants of Ezzelino, son-in-law of Frederick II., were astounded at the language of the friar and at the meek submission of their general. "It seemed to me," he said, "that the eyes of that monk darted forth flashes of lightning, and that I was on the point of being hurled headlong into the abyss of hell."

St. Anthony is called "The Restorer of Lost Things." Many appeal to him for such favors and often wonderful restorations are recounted. St. Anthony himself lost his written work, "Commentary on the Psalms." He treasured this highly. He was in deep trouble when he found that it had been stolen. He had immediate recourse to prayer. The thief was suddenly stopped in his flight by a monster on the banks of a river. He was commanded on pain of death to restore the MSS. immediately. He hastened back and St. Anthony got his treasure. This was the origin of the special prerogative of St. Anthony.

I have not time to write of St. Anthony's Bread, of the blessing of St. Anthony on seed-grain, on the blessing of a child with an equal weight of grain, the nine Tuesdays, etc., etc.

St. Anthony died at Padua on the 13th of June, 1231. He was then only in his thirty-seventh year. Crowds of children inspired, ran about the streets crying: "The saint is dead! St. Anthony is dead!" He appeared at the same moment to his friend, the Abbot of Vercelli and said, with a smile: "I have left my luggage at Padua. I am on my way home."

In less than a year St. Anthony was canonized. I do not know of any other saint who was so quickly crowned with the honor of canonization. His mother and his sisters were still living. When his mother died, there was inscribed on her tomb an epitaph that constitutes the highest panegyric: "*Hic jacet mater Sancti Antonii*." (Here lies the mother of St. Anthony.)

There is very much to be written of St. Anthony from the places of his last labors, of his death and of his shrine. I will briefly jot down a few facts that may be of interest. The basilica of St. Anthony is one of the ecclesiastical gems of Italy. It is a mixture of Gothic and Byzantine architecture. It produces a wonderful effect with its dome, cupolas and elegant campaniles. It is filled with treasures of art. The Senate and citizens of Padua, realizing that the body of St. Anthony was the greatest treasure they possessed, began almost immediately after the saint's death to erect a church and monastery in his honor. The chapel of St. Anthony is separated from the main church by a row of slender pillars. There are five lofty rounded arches enriched with medallions of the four evangelists and marble statues of St. Anthony, St. Justina, St. John the Baptist, etc. In the center of the richly decorated chapel stands the altar of green marble, enclosing the silver sarcophagus of the saint approached by seven steps with finely executed marble balustrade. The noble vaulted roof is in white and gold and the walls are enriched with scenes from the life of the saint, many of which I have written of in this letter. There are also in the chapel marble statues of angels and massive silver candelabra weighing over 250 pounds. I cannot stop to describe the treasure house of the saint. It contains a dazzling array of precious metals, gems and priceless art treasures. There are reliquaries, brilliant with diamonds, golden vessels, jewelled chalices, thuribles and other votive offerings of fabulous beauty and price. At night the place is guarded by two huge mastiffs, called "the dogs of St. Anthony."

We were loth to leave the blessed shrine of the wonder worker, but time pressed and we had to hasten on. In a compartment on the way to Venice we had the company of three professors from the University of Padua.—Catholic Universe.

DEATH OF BISHOP NULTY.

Dublin, Dec. 24.—The Most Rev. Thos. Nulty, D. D., a Catholic Bishop of the diocese of Meath since 1864, is dead.

The late Bishop of Meath was one of the most prominent and popular ecclesiastics in Ireland. He first attracted attention when a simple curate by defending the claims of the people against the landlords, and his writings on the land question are often quoted and held as texts. Bishop Nulty belonged to one of the oldest septs in that portion of Ireland in which his See is located. As a young priest he witnessed the distressing scenes of the Irish famine and saw the evictions of the remnant of his flock, which he has described in his published letters in the Irish papers of those days. Dr. Nulty was a Nationalist of decided type.

R. I. P.

REGIOPOLIS COLLEGE, KINGSTON, ONT.

The Business and Shorthand Department of Regiopolis reopens Jan. 3, with a chartered accountant in charge. The yearly scholarship costs only \$30, monthly payments. Diploma courses are completed in three to six months, individual instruction. Write for Calendar; it explains all. Enter early.