

The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XV.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, MARCH 25, 1893.

NO. 733.

The Hoosier Folk-Child.

The Hoosier Folk-Child—all unsmiling—
Unlettered all of mind and tongue—
Unmastered, unmolested inside—
Most wholly frank and unafraid—
Untroubled of any school—unweaved
Of law or creed—all unperplexed—
Unsummed, eye, and undivided,
An all imperfect-perfect child—
A type which (Heaven forgive us!) you
And do not tardy honor to,
And so profane the sanctities
Of our most sacred memories.
Who, growing thus from boy to man,
That does not be American?
Go, pride, with prudent underbush—
Go whistle in the Folk-Child's loss—
The Hoosier Folk-Child's world is not
Much wider than the stable lot
Between the house and highway fence
That bounds the home his father rents.
His playmates mostly are the ducks
And chickens, and the boy that "snucks"
And whether eyes are "up" or "down,"
And prophetic of his own,
And "being his own man," and "when
He gets to be, what he'll be,"
Worn by the shock, or "crave"
And makes the Folk-Child two or three
Crude cornstalk figures—a few span
Of horses and a little man.
The Hoosier Folk-Child's eyes are wise
And wide and round as Browie's eyes;
The smile they wear is ever blent—
With all expectant wonderment—
On homeliest things they blend a look
As rap as o'er a picture book,
And seem to ask, what'er befall,
The happy reason of it all.
Why grass is all so glad and green
And leaves—and what their meanings mean—
Why buds grow on the boughs, and why
They burst in blossom by and by—
As though the orchard in the breeze
Had shook and popped its popcorn trees,
To lure and what, as well they might,
Some seven-league giant's appetite?
The Hoosier Folk-Child's chubby face
Has scorned refinement, taste, or grace—
From crown to chin and cheek to cheek,
It bears the grimy water streak
Of raindrops such as come from rain
Might drizzle across the window pane
Where through he peers, with troubled frown,
In some lone teardrop lives by the town.
His brow is etched with wisplish hair,
With tangles in it here and there,
As though the breeze, as snuffed it so,
At midnight when the moon suggest
And boughs did toss and stir and shake,
And children moaned themselves awake
With fingers clutched, and staring sight
Blind as the blackness of the night!
The Hoosier Folk-Child—Rich is he
In all the wealth of poverty!
He owns no title nor estate—
Nor speech but his own native—
He owns no princely robe nor crown—
Yet, draped in patched and faded brown,
He owns the bird songs of the hills—
The laughter of the April rills—
And his are all the diamonds set
In homing's dewy coronet—
And his the Duke's first minted stars
That twinkle through the pasture bars.
And litter all the skies at night—
With glittering scraps of silvery light—
The rainbow's bar, from rim to rim,
In beaten gold, below—
—James Whitcomb Riley.

CATHOLIC TENETS UPHELD.

By a Clergyman of the Church of England.

In the above heading we give the title as reported in the *Church Times*, of one of the papers read at the recent Church Congress at Folkestone—that by Prebendary Sadler. It is decidedly more worthy of the attention of Catholics than the generality of these compositions, many of which are of purely sectarian and transient interest. The subject is one which can never cease to be of primary importance to mankind, and as Mr. Sadler appears to advocate a theory considerably less antagonistic to the Catholic rule of faith than many of his co-religionists—notably the latest Anglican authority on *Infallibility*, Dr. Salmon of Dublin—we do not think it will be time wasted to devote some few words to the consideration of his essay. It would almost seem as though Mr. Sadler's paper had been commenced by one hand and completed by another, so conspicuous is the contrast between the strength and straightforwardness of his opening sentences and the weakness and inconsequence of his conclusion. So marked indeed is this difference as to constitute what would be a decided change of front, were it not evident that the speaker does not realize the logical result of his own first principles. However, we will let him speak for himself. (The italics are our own.)

“THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH.” he commences, “and the authority of the New Testament were originally the same; they both rested on the authority of the Apostles.” Apostolic authority is displayed in a twofold form, manifesting itself in Scripture and tradition. “It pleased God that all the books of the New Testament should be written by the Apostles or under their direct supervision and dictation. Now we have to consider the fact that every line of the Apostolic Epistles assumes that each one of the Christian churches to which it was sent was already instructed in the fullness of the Christian faith—not merely in outlines, but in the filling up of such outlines. In no one Epistle do we find the Christian faith set forth *ab initio*. All assume that those to whom the Epistle was written were well acquainted with it. From the first planting of the Gospel there was a very large body of Christian teaching in all departments of Christian doctrine; given at first by the apostles, and given by them for the purpose of being handed so that it should form the first instruction of Christians. When did it cease to be such? Not only were they to hand down to others the teaching by letter, but that which apparently had never been committed to writing. How long did this last? It must have lasted for two or three centuries side by side with the Scriptures of the New Testament, for it formed the original Apostolic instruction, and the various books of the New Testament came in, not all at once, but as it were in separate streams. Of the seventeen or eighteen Apostolic Epistles not one was a document containing primary instruction. We do not find in any one of

them an account, in order, of any one Christian doctrine. The oral teaching of the Apostles then is the root of what is called the authority of the Church; that is, authority for *dogmas*, or teaching of practices which are not written in so many words in the New Testament.

AN EPOCH IN THE HISTORY OF ANGLICANISM.
So far, so good. There is scarcely a syllable in all this to which a Catholic theologian could take exception, and it must have sounded strange in the ears of an assembly composed largely of clerical gentlemen, dignified and indignant, all of whom had subscribed to the sixth article of religion *On the Sufficiency of Scripture*. The “The Bible and the Bible only” theory of a former generation of Protestants, Mr. Sadler evidently discards! But this, as a matter of fact, has long ago been done by the Tractarians, who recognized the claims of tradition so far as to admit that the consent of the Fathers was the only true rule of interpreting the sacred writings. Mr. Sadler, however, he it noted, goes very much further. He recognizes this “oral teaching of the Apostle” as being, equally with the Scriptures, a phase of the apostolic delivery of the divine revelation, and while equal to them, independent of, and separate from them; containing and teaching explicitly doctrines which are not to be found explicitly in the Written Word. At least we do not know how else to interpret the expression, “dogmas which are not written in so many words in the New Testament.” This is certainly a great advance upon the old Tractarian hypothesis. It is not the whole truth, very far from it. But it is such a long step forward in the right direction that, could we only believe that Prebendary Sadler voices the growing views of any considerable number of his fellow-clergyman, we should not perhaps be guilty of exaggeration in saying that the enunciation of this theory alone marks out the Folkestone Church Congress as an epoch in the history of Anglicanism. One or two additional excerpts, however, from the latter half of his paper will serve to show how little he himself appreciates the logical conclusion of his own hypothesis.

“The authority of the Church,” he says, “appears in early ages in two forms: in the decrees of the General Councils—of course I except the publication of such a document as that which is called the Nicene Creed by the first General Council—seem in great part to have been directed against temporary scandals. The earliest of them, the Nicene, contains many canons, the substance of which can hardly have come down from apostolic times. Owing to the altered circumstances of the Church, the greater part cannot now be acted upon, so that the principle form in which Apostolic authority, external to Holy Scripture, is valuable to us, is the consent of the earliest Fathers.”

THE HOLY EUCHARIST.
Mr. Sadler then proceeds to illustrate his thesis by taking the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, regarding which he cites certain well-known passages from St. Ignatius, St. Justin Martyr, and St. Irenaeus, which have no special bearing upon the point we are considering, and concludes as follows: “When the leading writers of the Reformation period—I instance particularly Cranmer and Ridley—appeal to the Primitive Fathers as those by whom they desire to be guided in their doctrinal utterances it is not a matter of sentiment, but of common sense; for the earliest writers had the means of ascertaining the mind of the Apostles which we have not. Now if these apostolic utterances were, though unwritten, the inspired declarations of the Holy Spirit, it is a very serious matter to neglect any means of knowing them. We are not, of course, slavishly to follow one witness or two, but we are to endeavor humbly and prayerfully to ascertain their consent and agreement; and if we find them to be all but unanimous on certain matters, then we have the satisfaction of knowing that we have done our best to ascertain the mind of God on some of the deepest mysteries of the faith.”

CHURCH AUTHORITY.
Now the theory and idea of “Church Authority” which Mr. Sadler here lays before us, very beautiful and very plausible as it might be had Divine Providence furnished us with nothing better, is not the theory laid down by our Lord. It is simply the extension of the Lutheran principle of private judgment beyond the range of the written Scriptures—which are inspired, and in all their parts have God for their author—to a mass of manner, originally inspired, but now lying embedded *passim* in the writings of uninspired authors, with the result, at least, of rendering the task of ascertaining God's Word a hundred times more difficult, and the risk of error far greater. The “supernatural” element in the Church's life, the guiding spirit which is the very principle of active as distinguished from passive tradition, is, as we shall presently see, entirely ignored; and, so far as we have any means of gathering from Mr. Sadler's words, the Church was left with nothing but human means—human perspicacity—and human care—to collect the Apostolic *paradosis* and to certify alike to the genuineness and the true meaning of this vast *depositum*

fidei, whose existence in and from the beginning he so candidly recognizes. MISUNDERSTANDING OF TRADITION.

This flaw in Mr. Sadler's conception of “Church Authority”—a flaw which renders the expression “authority” a misnomer, while it deprives his theory of all real utility as a workable hypothesis—arises simply from the fact that, although very far in advance of the average Anglican, he entirely fails to grasp the true nature and function of Tradition. He sees plainly enough that this element is provided for and recognized in the Apostolic Epistles, but he seems to forget Our Lord's own words in this connection: “As my Father hath sent me, I also send you.” “I will ask the Father and He shall give you another Paraclete, that He may abide with you forever.” “Going therefore, teach all nations to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world.” Two elements are manifestly present in these divine promises—(1) an element of supernatural guidance, informing and constituting an infallible teaching authority, and (2) an element of perpetuity.

TWO VIEWS OF DIVINE TRADITION.
Hence Divine tradition, according to Catholic theologians, may be viewed under two distinct aspects: the first, objective or material, the second, active or formal. By material tradition is signified the whole body of doctrine delivered to the Apostles by Our Lord, or by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, some of which is contained explicitly in the Scriptures, and some—a fact which Mr. Sadler seems to recognize—not so contained, but is handed down from age to age in the Church through certain recognized channels, chief among which are the works of the Fathers, the Acts of the Ecumenical Councils, the Sacred Liturgy, etc.

THE VIEWS HELD BY THE FATHERS.
Mr. Sadler, in common with almost all Anglicans, confuses material with formal tradition, or, rather, the latter has no place in his creed. Authority, therefore, as we shall see presently, in any true sense of the word, is altogether foreign to his system. The only use that he can make of the *material* of tradition, lying embedded in the uninspired works of antiquity, is to treat it much as Evangelicals treat the Bible, with the additional burden laid upon the private judgment of the individual, of distinguishing between matters revealed and matters not revealed. What guarantee has Mr. Sadler that either he, or Cranmer, or Ridley, when in the exercise of their “common sense” they have “humbly and prayerfully” searched the Fathers, will have really culled from them what is divine and not what is merely human? He himself claims a guarantee in their consent. But this is the merest *ignis fatuus*, it is a system which will never work, it will never lead to the possession of certain truth resting upon infallible authority. There is nothing more certain, to those who know even the elements of Patristic Theology, than that the “earliest Fathers” are in verbal disagreement one with another, with regard even to the “deepest mysteries of the faith.” “That the language of the ante-Nicene Fathers on the subject of our Lord's Divinity,” says Cardinal Newman in his “Essay on Development” (p. 135), may be far more easily accommodated to the Arian hypothesis than the language of the post-Nicene, is agreed on all hands.” And he tells us elsewhere (p. 17) that “if we limit our view of the Fathers to what they expressly state, St. Ignatius may be considered as a Hippolytus, St. Justin Ariminus, St. Hippolytus speaks as though he were ignorant of our Lord's Eternal Sonship, St. Methodius speaks incorrectly at least upon the Incarnation.” That all these Fathers meant what the Church believes, we may willingly concede; but surely this is only an additional proof of the necessity of formal tradition, the authoritative voice of the “Ecclesia Docens” defining and teaching, separating the revealed from the non-revealed. Had the Church not spoken, is Mr. Sadler so sure that he, individually, would have had clearer or more explicitly orthodox opinions, would have been more successful in separating, in the works of the Fathers, the wheat of the revealed from the chaff of the non-revealed, than St. Hippolytus or St. Methodius were in writing them?

THE ORIGIN OF AUTHORITY.
And yet this searching for consent among the Fathers, not merely for their interpretation of Scripture, but for doctrines which, while equal to Scripture as “inspired declarations of the Holy Ghost,” are not found explicitly therein, would appear—apart from the Constantinopolitan Creed, and possibly the Definition of Faith of Chalcedon—to be Mr. Sadler's only idea of “Church Authority.” Why surely a heathen with a “Library of the Fathers” at his disposal, could in the course of his own reading do as much. Where then is the authority? Is it the authority—the intrinsic authority—possessed by this or that patriotic writing in itself? But that is not the authority of the Church. When, however, we have eliminated the personal authority of the student, that is, his own private judgment, and the author-

ity of weight due to the author he is studying, there is not a shred, not a ghost of authority left.

INANITY OF THE OLD PROTESTANT THEORY.

Authority, if it is to be heard and heeded, must be plain spoken. The voice of the *propheta propheticum* must be univocal. That guiding Spirit, whose office it is to abide with the *Ecclesia Docens* throughout all time, teaching it all truth, who alone is the principle of the teaching authority of the Church, cannot contradict Himself. He cannot imbue one humble and prayerful student of the Fathers with a brief—say—in our Lord's real objective presence in the Eucharist, and another, equally humble, equally prayerful, with the conviction of His real objective absence. Mr. Sadler sees plainly enough that the old Protestant theory will not hold water, that it cannot be made to fit in with the conception of “Church Authority” set forth in the Pauline Epistles. But, to be consistent, he must go a step further than this. He admits that the *depositum* which was delivered by our Lord to the Apostles was “handed on” by them, and he styles this “Church Authority;” but he fails to see that our Lord's words necessarily imply that the guidance necessary for the exercise of this authority must also have been handed on. He should remember our Lord Himself has stamped His own divine meaning on the word *paradosis*. Let him carry out his theory to its logical result.—*Rev. Arthur H. Cullen in London Tablet.*

SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

N. Y. Sun.

A correspondent in the interior of this State writes to us that as a result of eight years' study of science and of theology he has got himself into a snarl, from which he asks us to extricate him. Here is his case, and, as he seems to be a conscientious man, we will do the best we can for him:

“One cannot fail to see the great difference between the Bible story of the creation (or rather stories, because there are two) and the scientific theory. I have read and reread the nebular hypothesis, and have reasoned it out in my own mind, and found no conflicting thought. How, then, can I accept the Bible story, and if I do, which one, the one that ends with man, or the one that begins with man?”

“Similar difficulties present themselves when I try to compare the Bible and modern astronomy. Then I compare the evidences we have of primitive man with the chronology of the Bible, and again I grope in darkness and mystery. I will not speak of ethnological problems, but they will present themselves to the thoughtful mind. Then, on the other hand, when I turn to the New Testament and read and reflect on the teachings of Jesus, I am compelled to exclaim with the writer: ‘Never spake man as this!’

“Now, to sum up: Science appeals to my reason, religion to my affections. If I cannot make the two harmonize, which shall control? Shall I give up my science, or shall I give up my religion?”

Ten or fifteen years ago we should have been at a loss how to advise this skeptical young man with a strong religious sentiment warring with his religious doubts. We should have been obliged to tell him that, until one or the other had conquered, it would be impossible for him to find a place in which to get rest for his soul. He is simply going through the old battle between faith and infidelity, and, according to the orthodoxy of the past, while that is proceeding the man cannot obtain the shelter of its fold. It demanded that he should conquer his doubts to make him eligible for admission into the Church. Nobody who questioned the absolute truth and divine perfection of the Bible was allowed to come in. He had to remain outside in the ranks of the Infidels.

Now, however, the situation has changed radically. Our skeptical correspondent's state of mind is no bar to his admission into the most orthodox of Churches, the Presbyterian, for instance, if we continue the designation formerly applied. If he is otherwise qualified, his criticisms of the Bible constitute no obstacle to his ordination as a Presbyterian minister, in the New York Presbytery at least, or to his subsequent appointment as a professor in a Presbyterian theological seminary. He has no reason to be troubled in soul because of his doubts, for Dr. Van Dyke describes such belief as he craves to be a matter of non-sensational opinion merely.

Dr. Briggs went through the same process of questioning the Bible, and reached the conclusion of rejecting everything which did not command itself to his reason; yet he has been adjudged by the New York Presbytery a good enough Presbyterian for these days. Our correspondent and he stand on substantially the same ground so far as concerns science and religion. When the Bible conflicts with the estimation of Dr. Briggs, and he does not vex himself more over the matter, he explains to be a compilation of ancient records and traditions made centuries after the time of Moses; and the contradiction of which our friend

speaks, he ascribes to the carelessness of the unknown editors. Under the teaching of Dr. Briggs, justified by the New York Presbytery, this young man is needlessly alarming himself and undertaking an impossible task in trying to reconcile the Bible with modern astronomy, geology and ethnology.

Hence, in reply to his final question, whether he shall give up science or religion, we advise him to keep both and become a Presbyterian.

HOME RULE.

The *World's* London cable says:—The events of the week in parliament have amply justified Mr. Gladstone's foresight in postponing the Home Rule bill until after Easter. Even without the Home Rule debate, financial business will take all the time left.

Whatever soreness prevailed at first in the Irish ranks at deferring Home Rule for a fortnight has completely worn off. Mr. Gladstone wrote a long letter from his sick bed to Justin McCarthy justifying his action. This was read at a meeting of the members of the Irish party, and they were satisfied by Mr. Gladstone's assurances.

The House of Commons will be called together again on either the 4th or 6th of April. There is grumbling at this arrangement among the Tories, who say a five day holiday vacation is not enough. The fact is it cuts into their plans for the Ulster Orange campaign, which begins on the 5th, as it compels all the Orange members to be back in Parliament.

The illness of Lord Salisbury is also a drawback to the Ulster movement, for, though there is no doubt that he is actually ill with influenza, some Orangemen say his illness is a sham so that he can get out of leading the Orange revolt. Ulster is divided between Mr. Balfour and Lord Randolph Churchill as a substitute leader, but Mr. Balfour is unwilling to go there.

Lord Salisbury's condition makes his family anxious. His son, Lord Cranborne, when privately asked last night about his father's illness, said the doctors are uneasy, and will be so while there is a chance of the influenza attacking his lungs.

READY TO LINE DITCHES.
John Dillon, Nationalist M. P. for East Mayo, in speaking to a Glasgow audience on the 20th, said that if in the trouble with Ulster it came to lining ditches the Home Rule Irishmen could hold their own with anybody. He scouted the idea of the persecution of Protestants by Catholics in Ireland. Nevertheless, he said, the Irish are willing to submit to the humiliation of having clauses for the protection of Protestants in Ireland inserted in the Home Rule Bill.

Lord Salisbury is confined to his bed and has been forbidden by his physicians to attend to any business whatever. He has sent a despatch to Belfast saying that he hopes to be able to address the meeting of Unionists there on April 4.

FOR THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

TEARS.

You marvel I never weep:
The shallow waters o'erflow,
Not the deep:
I think, and my thoughts are tears.

You marvel I never weep:
The sun dries Aurora's tears,
Wept in midnight sleep:
I pray, and my prayers are tears.

Why should I weep?
Tears enough on life's pathway,
Rugged and steep:
I smile, and my smiles are tears. —J. M.

A Convert Queen.

Marie, Queen of Bavaria, widow of King Maximilian and first cousin of William, Emperor of Germany, who died at Elbingen on the 19th of May, 1889, was a convert to the Church, and led a life of extraordinary piety. There has rarely been a prince or princess who valued less the earthly splendors of a great name, and added more imperishable honor to it. She maintained (says the *Ace Maria*) the strictest simplicity of dress and surroundings, and was indefatigable in doing good; while she was so truly humble that she bore the bitterest humiliations with perfect resignation. Twice a week she went to confession, and at least four times a week approached Holy Communion. She could not be induced to have a special seat in the church, but insisted upon praying in the midst of the poor country people; “for” she said, “before the majesty of God all earthly greatness is as naught.”

The Redeemptorist Fathers, when conducting a mission at Elbingen, noticed in the congregation one regular and especially interested attendant, who proved to be the Dowager Queen of Bavaria. The profound devotion with which she followed the exercises of the mission made a strong impression upon the clergy and was an example to the people.

On one occasion when the parish priest wished to take the Blessed Sacrament to a sick person, it happened that there was no one to accompany him. The Queen was praying in the church, and, divining the need of the priest, she went into the sanctuary, took the lantern with the blessed candle and, ringing the little bell, led the way through the streets.

Queen Marie walking and praying before the Blessed Sacrament on its

way to the hotel of the poor is a picture worthy a place in the gallery of the confessors of the faith.

CATHOLIC PRESS.

AVE MARIA.

An external conformity with Catholic usage is making rapid strides among the various sects. It is significant when ministers of the Evangelical denominations hold meetings for the avowed purpose of arranging some special religious services for the season of Lent. A quarter of a century ago such a step would have provoked the most bitter opposition, but it appears to have been looked upon as a very desirable and proper innovation. No one rushed forward with wild denunciations of “Romish” practices; no one appeared to be alarmed lest the faith of Puritan ancestors be imperilled. The world moves. The descendants of the Pilgrims build Gothic places of worship, decorate them at Easter and Christmas, maintain a friendly rivalry in regard to music and flowers at those great feasts. Formerly—and not long ago either—the cross was confined to Catholic architecture; now it is no uncommon sight to see even a Congregational, Methodist or Presbyterian meeting-house surmounted by the emblem of man's redemption. May the true religion of the Cross make haste to follow these outward tokens!

In many quarters, especially perhaps in Spain, Freemasons are seeing the error of their ways, and forsaking the pernicious organization to which they were allured by political or other reasons, and returning to the fold from whence they strayed. A notable instance of this is seen in the recantation of Senor Raja Arias, who has acknowledged his error and become reconciled to Mother Church. Another prominent member of the Order, Don Martinez, an avowed freethinker, has also abjured his errors, delivered over all his Masonic books and papers, and begged to be restored to the communion from which he separated himself. He had been most violent in his attacks upon the Church, and his recantation has caused much rejoicing. Meanwhile in Italy the Freemasons are more than ordinarily active and unyielding. The editor of an excellent paper at Genoa, desiring to circulate pamphlets embodying the Holy Father's letter upon Freemasonry, applied, simply as a matter of form, to the Quersura for permission, only to have his request instantly and indignantly refused.

The Cares of a Bishop.

To the Bishop are entrusted priest and people, and on him more than on any other man depends the religious destinies of both. Priests who have left home and sometimes country, who give up human love and human ambition and the pursuit of wealth, depend on him as on a father. A single error of judgment on his part may make one of them unhappy for life. Whilst lifted above them by his episcopal character he is yet only their brother in the priesthood, and he must ever respect the priesthood of Jesus Christ in them as in himself. —*Archbishop Ryan.*

SPECIAL TO THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

NIAGARA NOTES.

Michael Fitzpatrick died suddenly while attending divine service at the church of Our Lady of Peace, Falls View, Ont., on St. Patrick's Day last. Deceased was an old and faithful domestic of Loretto Academy. He leaves a wife and two daughters to mourn his loss. His end was sudden but not unprepared. The interment took place the next day.

The second performance of *Paradise*, by the choir of St. Patrick's, Niagara Falls, Ont., on March 17 was unusually well executed. The town hall was packed to overflowing. The conference of the St. Catharines Deanery met on March 11 at the Falls View Manse. Very Rev. Dean Harris presided. Subjects theological and liturgical underwent a lengthy discussion.

The Rev. P. J. Harrell of Niagara-on-the-Lake, is taking a well-earned rest in the “Sunny South.”

Rev. Father Lafontaine has lately succeeded Rev. Father McBain as pastor of Smithville.

The C. M. B. A. fall of members at Snyder, Ont., is making rapid strides towards a lighter water mark.

The Titular Feast was celebrated with becoming solemnity at St. Joseph's church, New Germany, Ont., on the 29th inst.

The Reverend Mother Superior of the Ladies of Loretto has been of late paying an official visit to the convent at Niagara Falls. An interesting and exhaustive work on the early Catholic mission around Niagara Falls is being compiled by the Very Reverend Dean Harris of St. Catharines. The subject could not be treated by a more able pen than that of Father Harris.

The “Social Lion” was performed at Thorold, Ont., on the 17th. The proceeds go to the treasury of Holy Rosary Church.

“St. Patrick and his Mission” was ably handled by Rev. Father Kreidt, superior of the Hospice at Falls View, at St. Patrick's Church, Hamilton, on the morning of the 17th. In the evening the reverend lecturer held forth at Thorold, Ont. On the 21st Father Kreidt will deliver the panegyric on St. Benedict at the Church of the Benedictine Fathers in Erie, Pa.

The triennial chapter of the Carmelites of Canada and the United States will convene at Pittsburgh, Pa., soon after Easter.

A letter just received from Ireland says that Rev. J. E. Foshan, O. C. S. C., formerly pastor at Niagara Falls, Ont., lies in a very low condition at the Carmelite Monastery in Dublin. —P. A. B.

THE WORLD'S FAIR.

SEPARATE SCHOOL EXHIBITS.

Good photographs of school exhibits form a very important item in the Columbian Exhibition. In a list of such, recently published in the *Record*, Berlin and Bradford were inadvertently omitted. We have seen the photographs of the Separate schools of these two places and consider them most elaborate and beautiful pictures.