

BANK CANADA CHARTER 1854

8 KING ST. WEST TORONTO

ty Accounts

ENTS handled for ches, Lodges, So. s. and Athletic organizations.

stances accorded rangers who have in charge. Full interest paid on nces.

394 Richmond St.

MISSIONS A DISTINCT SPECIALTY

New Imported Brass Goods Altar Plate Vestments, Etc.

M. LANDY

TORONTO Res. Phone Foll. 452

ing Beautiful Illustrations

ST READY—26th Year

Home Annual

R 1909

entipsies in Colors and of other Illustrations.

E 25 CENTS

Per dozen \$2.00

esting Articles of the Best mical Calculations—Cal- s and Fasts—A Household eading for the Family

IS OF THE 1909 ISSUE.

atholic Progress, By M.M.A.

ce Came In. By MARION s of Wisconsin.

ip Sheridan, Civil War MAURICE FRANCIS EGAN, L.L.B.

ars. By ANNA T. SAEED.

ie of an Indian Maiden, Y of THAGAWA, the SAKTY Illustrations.

ity. By JEROME HARTZ. THEM

GRACE KEON. By MAGDALEN ROCK. Illustrations

atholic Record

EDON, CANADA

NDLES

WILL & BAUJER

-KIND

ail Qualities

All Sizes

All Shapes

BEST on the MARKET

nds—Stearine, Argand and Star

Beewax Standard Altar

L'Autel & Purissima

END FOR PRICE LIST

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

ON - CANADA

le Farm

erty For Sale

Twenty Acres situated four

North on 1 section Nine Township

ng, climatic conditions favoring s. n

SMITH & SON

Manufacturers of Seats, Pulpits, Altars, Desks, Lecterns, Chairs, Etc.

LEY - ONTARIO

Branch No. 4, London

and 4th Township 9 every month

st their hall, in 1000 Block, Rich-

URMAN F. GORDON, President JAMES

The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XXXI.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY JUNE 19, 1909.

1600

The Catholic Record

LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 19, 1909.

THINKING OUT LOUD.

The Rev. Dr. C. Starbuck chides Professor Wheeler, of Yale, for saying that improved ploughs are of a great deal more importance to Turkey than a host of missionaries. It is rather surprising, we agree, that such indecent insults can be heaped by the professor of a Christian university to the religion of his colleague and of his country. A learned man, however, may nod betimes, and as Professor Wheeler, have his intellect improperly exposed. He should betake himself to the University of Chicago, in which he would find congenial spirits who invent and discover things that never get without academic halls.

NOT LIKE OLD TIMES.

Some of our separated brethren in England are lamenting that these secular priests give undue prominence to reports of things Catholic. They sigh for the days when Catholics in England were found in corners and alleys and cellars and the houseposts or in the recesses of the country; cut off from the populous world around them and dimly seen, as if through a mist or in twilight, as ghosts flitting to and fro by the high Protestants, the lords of the earth. To a somewhat heated communication on this matter an editor rejoins that newspapers publish the news or stories told in crisp and entertaining style. Hence they refuse access to antiquated abuse because they opine that readers have no taste for echoes of Hume and Gibbon, garnished with revelations of converted priests and escaped nuns, or of individuals who look upon the world through the glasses of prejudice. The day of had faith or gross ignorance is about done. Romance, masquerading as history, has been assigned to its proper place. An Anglican clergyman has so stripped Henry VIII. and Elizabeth of eulogistic tinsel as to make the educated beware of describing the one as “bluff and honest Hal,” or the other as the good Virgin Queen Bess. Hunter, Jaussen, Pastor, and lately Denifle, have destroyed many a fiction about the German reformers, and this without a protest worthy of notice. Thanks to these indefatigable delvers in libraries and archives, the middle ages are no longer referred to as ages of ignorance and corruption. It is not believed now that indulgences were sold to the wealthy for liberty to sin without danger. The Pope is not the monster of the Protestant nursery tale. Misconceptions in brief are being dispelled daily by the light of knowledge. And so the old ding-dong which has seared town and country this weary time, tolling and chiming away, jingling and clamoring and ringing the changes in their poor half-dozen notes, is heard but in the Lodges, merely, we believe, to placate some of the brethren.

TOURISTS OF A SORT.

Tourists and travellers of a certain type press into service the hallucinations of morbid imaginations. Though history score these old stories with a bar sinister, and scholarship regard them as signs of better-minded partisans, some novelists cuddled them with a complacency that is positively bewildering. When the average individual fits into other countries he may be both edified and instructed. But some tourists either do not use their eyes or are duped by the natives. Their talk about Catholics becoming Protestant as soon as they begin to read the Bible, of fair maidens decoyed into gloomy cloisters, is very wearisome. If they must see ghosts they should drape them in fiery that does not smell of the charnel house.

But lately we read excerpts from “Notes of Travel” by a good man who journeyed afar and got seemingly into bad company. What caused him to suffer the most was the desecration of the Sabbath. He poured forth his grief and indignation in a torrent of unpleasant words. We felt for him, for his agony was acute and beyond cure, we fear, until he has a suspicion that laughter is not necessarily sinful and that men can be happy and show it even on the Sabbath without incurring censure. Perchance the good man was the counterpart of the millionaire in the art gallery who asked if Mrs. “Madonna” lived in that town.

MR. J. HOCKING.

Mr. Joseph Hocking, novelist, is, pardon us, an “amooosin’ cuss.” In fighting Rome his weapon is not the

rapier but the bludgeon, very rusty, it is true, but wielded energetically, and, if we take the Presbyterian’s endorsement of his action as sign of his prowess, not without success. But he overdoes it. He makes us laugh because he makes so much ado about nothing. Pointing to certain things designated by him as Catholic, Joseph takes the centre of the stage, and then in the name of liberty, or religion, or anything, demolishes them with his trusty bludgeon. Rather work and dust, but he seems to like it. But his criticisms of us are so grotesque as to be ridiculous. Feasting indoors with plenty of wine and beer, revelling in luxury and giving for consideration full absolution for sin, did not occupy the entire attention of the monks. If we believe non-Catholic historians they were very busy and useful members of society. Dr. Maitland tells us that the monastery was, in the days of misrule and turbulence, a refuge for helpless infancy and old age, as centre of agriculture, as repositories of the learning which then was, and well-springs of the learning that was to be, and as nurseries of art and science. And Lecky declares that the monastery was the center of civilization and industry, the symbol of moral power in an age of turbulence and war. The burly drinking friar is very deceiving and should be allowed to rest by writers of the delicate humor of Hoeking. He has done service since the days of Robelais and their wit can be directed against things that are, against, for example, the moral plagues that are inflicting the nation which has the open Bible.

THE POOR JESUIT.

Novelists of this type have a predilection for the Jesuit. We have seen female and male Jesuits coveting through a booklet the behest of the man behind the pen. They are always sly and designing; they invariably approach the Protestant with a soft, velvet, cat-like step; and they are accorded privileges of deportment that are allowed to inmates of lunatic asylums. Our regret is that they do not get hold of the novelist. But how a reputable journal, printed for the Protestant household, can countenance such twaddle is a mystery which we cannot solve.

TO BE REMEMBERED.

It has been said that if our Catholic instincts are to be of any real service to us in detecting and avoiding concealed dangers to faith and morality we must be able to give a rational account of the faith that is within us. For this purpose it is not sufficient to have attended parish school, to have learned our Catechism, to have said our prayers morning and night, to have heard Mass on Sundays and holidays of obligation, and to have frequented the sacraments, if between times we read nothing but cheap literature, and if, in maturer years, we confine ourselves to the daily paper, with its stock of scandal, irreligion and falsehood, and to the thousand and one works of fiction offered for a song by cheap book-stores and news vendors at the street corners.

VERY DISAGREEABLE—BUT.

When the Bishop of London visited America he dismissed snarlingly, if not satisfactorily, the charge that the English Reformation was fathered by Henry VIII. He went on to say that for generations churchmen had inhabited Fulham Palace, but he withheld the important fact that, while the pre-Reformation clergy acknowledged the spiritual headships of Peter, he acknowledges Edward VII. as his chief. He may ignore the fact that Henry VIII’s infatuation for Anne Boleyn was the occasion and origin of all the trouble, but historians of repute have no doubt on that point. “It may be very disagreeable,” says Dr. James Gairdner, “to trace the Reformation to such a very ignoble origin; but facts, as the Scottish poet says, ‘are fellows that you can’t coerce and that won’t bear to be disputed.’”

Talk of the tyranny of the See of Rome. Who felt it we wonder? Not Henry VIII. himself till he felt himself disappointed in the expectation which he had ardently cherished for awhile—that he could manage by hook or by crook to obtain from the See of Rome something like an ecclesiastical license for bigamy. The See of Rome refused this, and when Henry at length took the matter into his own hands by marrying Anne Boleyn, pronounced quite a righteous sentence that the former marriage was valid. All that the Pope could be reproached with was far too great deference to an unprin-

cipled sovereign in the vain hope that he would lay aside self-will and return to his obedience.

MR. TIMOTHY HEALY ON THE CATHOLIC DISABILITIES BILL.

In a recent debate in the English House of Commons, on the Royal Declaration, Mr. Timothy Healy spoke as follows:— Mr. T. M. Healy said it had been said that in England the King reigned, but did not govern. Who did govern in England? The Home Secretary. The Home Secretary was a Catholic under a Tory Government, in the person of Viscount Llandaff, Mr. Henry Mathews. That really shocked him (Mr. Healy). During all that time these sentiments of alarm existed, and there were also these subversive sentiments alleged to be found in some Catholic books—which were generally a misprint from the Latin (laughter). Then the late Lord Russell was a Catholic Lord Chief Justice of England. Was it safe to have a Lord Chief Justice with all these Jesuitic opinions burning like a furnace in his Papistical heart? What about one of the present Tory whips? (laughter). Was it a safe-guard against Papistry to have a Catholic Tory whip? Sir John Kennaway voted on a nod this way or that from this Catholic office of his party, and how did they know whether he was voting for Rome or Westminster? (laughter). Why had the King so many Catholics about him? Was he safe? Where was the Duke of Norfolk, who held the Crown before the King puts it on. He would like to say something on this question from the Protestant point of view. They ought to make up their minds what it was exactly they believed when they said they were Protestants and that the King must be a Protestant. Had Sir John Kennaway ever read the statute of Edward VI. He (Mr. Healy) did not understand what that term Protestant meant. It was not hard to understand what the Church of England was. It was a body established by law, of which the King was bound to be a member and of which he was head, as he was Defender of the Faith, as they saw on all the half pennies (laughter). He asked Sir John Kennaway would he subscribe to the Declaration of England do so? Let them after that refer to the first Statute of Edward VI. under which the Church of England carried out her services and ministrations. “K. John Kennaway” (laughter)—that was the position they put the King in—“do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare that I do believe that in the Sacrifice of the Lord’s Supper there is not any transubstantiation of the Elements from bread and water into the Body and Blood of Christ, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever.” Was that the doctrine of the Church of England? That was the Declaration of Edward VII. That the Statute of Edward VI. and he said that the King’s declaration was an absolute defiance of the law. There in the revised Statutes—as living and effective as any Statute passed last year—was a Statute which reverently speak against the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. It quoted the words of Our Lord at the Last Supper—“Take ye and eat of this. This is My Body,” and also “This is My Blood.” It quoted also that passage about him that “eateth and drinketh condemnation and judgment to himself, making of himself the Lord of the Church; and he declared—“This is eternal, infallible and undoubted truth.” It spoke of the “Most Holy and Blessed Sacrament,” of “the High Mystery,” and then it declared that anyone using contemptuous words despising or reviling the Sacrament should suffer imprisonment or fine at the King’s will and pleasure. The act from which the King was bound to take his oath for the King at all, but to prevent Catholics becoming members of that house. It was not an expression of Protestant doctrine. It picked out a central fact in the Catholic doctrine, so that the Catholics could not subscribe to it. As it said, it was an act “to disoblige Papists from sitting in either House of Parliament.” He believed the law was in force at all. The Act of Charles II. had gone generations ago. In the Bill of Rights it was provided that the King should take the oath set forth in the 30th of Charles II. That act had gone. There was no oath to take. There was a still fiercer declaration in the Bill of Rights with regard to foreign princes—Popes, prelates, or potentates—having any jurisdiction, ecclesiastical or spiritual, in England. The note on that in law books was “virtually repealed.” If the law officials of the Crown had said the same with regard to the oath in the Act of Charles II., the common sense of Parliament would have upheld them. In the absence of such action, his friends were bound to bring in bills of this kind for the purpose of decency. Every Colonial Parliament had passed resolutions in favor of a repeal of the Declaration. Were they only friendly with Canada when she offered Dreadnoughts? (laughter). Why not leave it to the Protestantism of the Sovereign himself? Or, let the Declaration be framed by the Archbishop of Canterbury or Consecration of England drew it up the non-Conformists might object (laughter). But his belief was that if it was left to the good sense of the monarch and his ministers he would make a declaration that would satisfy Protestant feeling. They had heard of the phrase “Trust the people.” Why not trust the King? (cheers). Did they not trust their King? Would his Majesty not be Protestant enough if he did not make this Declaration, offensive to twelve millions of his subjects. He

was not the King of Sandy row or of the Orange Lodges (laughter). He was King in Quebec, as well as in Combermere. He would have thought that they would be anxious to bring the King into touch and consonance with his Catholic subjects. Was there any modern circumstance to justify their fears? The Declaration, he believed, offended large numbers of Protestants in this country quite as much as it offended Catholics. Would the Archbishop of York make that declaration? Or the Archbishop of Canterbury or the members of Convocation, or the late Lord Salisbury? Would he have taken the oath which he presented to his Majesty? Would the son of Lord Salisbury in that House take it? Was there any Protestant adhering to the Church of England except the King himself upon whom they could impose such an appalling outrage upon his feelings. He thought the Statute was repealed and the oath no longer had any force. If it was not repealed it was not in accordance with the doctrines of the Church of England set out in the Statute of Edward VI. Nor was it Church of Ireland doctrine, because when they were revising the Prayer book after the Irish Church was disestablished they did not take out the words about which they had so much dispute—“The comfortable Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.” Having retained these high and awful words in their own formulae, whether they were Protestants in England or in Ireland, he could not see why they should refuse to repeal the abominable phrases contained in the King’s Declaration. (cheers).

Next societies are proud of their names. It serves to recall the principal virtues and deeds in which the society has found strength and honor. Not so with our Protestant Episcopal brethren—or at least with that active element in the Church, whose sentiments are voiced in the Living Church. They are overwhelmed with what they call “the unsavory association involved in our sectarian title.” So they would assume the designation “American Catholic Church.”

Verily, there is balm in Gilead. For what was thought to be bitter is found at last to be precious and sweet. The name Catholic is no longer the symbol of opprobrium, and the mere mention of the Catholic Church sits no distorted vision of the Babylonish woman in the minds of the saints is no longer idolatry, nor is the use of sacramental superstition. This is progress in spiritual intelligence on the part of non-Catholics. Now, some even would be called Catholics.

We should like to see all men Catholics, but we do not like to see all men assume the mere form of Catholicity and then lay claim to the name. The term Christian has been emptied by many of its meaning. We object to a similar abuse of the word Catholic. There is no use in pretension. Catholic stands for the one holy Church of God with its centre of apostolic unity, where the Prince of the Apostles placed it in Rome, and with its bounds of apostolic missionary activity set only by the ends of the earth.

What, then, is the purpose of this change? One of the motives, at least, is so unworthy of honorable men that we should impute it to no one, did not these missionaries for Christ claim it as their own. The editorial says:— “The workers in our foreign mission fields, made bold by the very wants of the untaught souls about them, are being compelled to throw aside the unsavory association involved in our sectarian title. Accordingly, we had the Church in Japan organized as “the Holy Catholic Church,” and our missionaries to Latin nations have asked to be allowed to drop the title Protestant Episcopal from their official documents, so that they may appear as Catholic to those to whom Catholic spells Christian.”

Thus, these teachers of the Christian faith, who at home are known by every name as Protestants, would declare in Catholic lands that they are Catholics for the noble purpose of leading real Catholics out of the real Catholic Church. They certainly are not members of the fold, but they would assume the sheep’s clothing that they may work undetected by the innocent sheep.

These are, indeed, rare aims and methods for a Christian teacher. Here in our land our brethren may call themselves what they please. We know what they are and a false title deceives few. But to assume in a strange land a great name that is not one’s own, but which proves an open sesame to the religious hearts of an innocent people is a method of missionary endeavor, devoid of the reported aims and aspirations of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America.

A nobler spirit, surely, is stirring the faith and devotion of these religious people. Their assumption of the forms and symbols of Catholic life are signs of

WHAT’S IN A NAME? The Living Church is disgusted with the title “Protestant Episcopal.” In a long editorial on “The Catholic Name Once More,” a most urgent plea is made for the assumption of the term “American Catholic Church.” Most societies are proud of their names. It serves to recall the principal virtues and deeds in which the society has found strength and honor. Not so with our Protestant Episcopal brethren—or at least with that active element in the Church, whose sentiments are voiced in the Living Church. They are overwhelmed with what they call “the unsavory association involved in our sectarian title.” So they would assume the designation “American Catholic Church.” Verily, there is balm in Gilead. For what was thought to be bitter is found at last to be precious and sweet. The name Catholic is no longer the symbol of opprobrium, and the mere mention of the Catholic Church sits no distorted vision of the Babylonish woman in the minds of the saints is no longer idolatry, nor is the use of sacramental superstition. This is progress in spiritual intelligence on the part of non-Catholics. Now, some even would be called Catholics. We should like to see all men Catholics, but we do not like to see all men assume the mere form of Catholicity and then lay claim to the name. The term Christian has been emptied by many of its meaning. We object to a similar abuse of the word Catholic. There is no use in pretension. Catholic stands for the one holy Church of God with its centre of apostolic unity, where the Prince of the Apostles placed it in Rome, and with its bounds of apostolic missionary activity set only by the ends of the earth. To be a member of that Church in faith and obedience is to be a Catholic. Not to be a member is to be a non-Catholic whether you stand so near in understanding and sympathy as to be a friend or so far away in ignorance and hatred as to be an enemy. Catholic whole world, the name stands for a definite institution faith and spirit. Any effort to assume that glorious title by those who protest against its spirit, is a fatuous proceeding.

What, then, is the purpose of this change? One of the motives, at least, is so unworthy of honorable men that we should impute it to no one, did not these missionaries for Christ claim it as their own. The editorial says:— “The workers in our foreign mission fields, made bold by the very wants of the untaught souls about them, are being compelled to throw aside the unsavory association involved in our sectarian title. Accordingly, we had the Church in Japan organized as “the Holy Catholic Church,” and our missionaries to Latin nations have asked to be allowed to drop the title Protestant Episcopal from their official documents, so that they may appear as Catholic to those to whom Catholic spells Christian.”

Thus, these teachers of the Christian faith, who at home are known by every name as Protestants, would declare in Catholic lands that they are Catholics for the noble purpose of leading real Catholics out of the real Catholic Church. They certainly are not members of the fold, but they would assume the sheep’s clothing that they may work undetected by the innocent sheep.

These are, indeed, rare aims and methods for a Christian teacher. Here in our land our brethren may call themselves what they please. We know what they are and a false title deceives few. But to assume in a strange land a great name that is not one’s own, but which proves an open sesame to the religious hearts of an innocent people is a method of missionary endeavor, devoid of the reported aims and aspirations of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America.

A nobler spirit, surely, is stirring the faith and devotion of these religious people. Their assumption of the forms and symbols of Catholic life are signs of

Thought prospers best in solitude; but the thinker is alone in the midst of crowds.

a soul-hunger that must be an inheritance from happier and more united days in the Christian world. While the Catholic Church respects their sincerity and sympathizes with their spiritual longings, she looks not with enmity but with pity on these futile efforts to reproduce in these dead forms the life of Christ’s Church. Names and forms are dead things without the Spirit. The Church prays that all sincere souls may find their Divine Spirit at last, who Christ sent Him to abide forever, in the one true fold of Peter and of Pius—Pilot.

THE HOLY FATHER ON WOMEN’S RIGHTS. SAYS THEIR DUTIES ARE NOT ENTIRELY CONFINED WITHIN THE CIRCLE OF THEIR FAMILIES. The great celebrations in Rome would have been incomplete without a special demonstration on the part of the Blessed Joan’s sisters and the Holy Father Vatican, says Rome, published in the Eternal City, when he received in audience a large gathering of women, including some of the noblest names in Italy and France, and representing the great organizations, Unione fra le Donne Cattoliche d’Italia, Ligue Patriotique Francaise, and Association des Dames de la France, and the president of the Italian organization, read an address promulgating His Holiness the co-operation of these bodies in his great work for the restoration of all things in Christ, and Pius X. made an important reply in which he touched upon some of the vital questions connected with the women’s movement of the day. Referring to the biblical account of the creation of woman whom God made to be the companion of man, and to the teachings of St. Paul who declares that woman is subject to man, the Holy Father pointed out that it was an error to suppose that woman has the same rights and the same social functions as man. She is not his slave or his servant, but his companion and helpmate. His functions are different but both equally noble, and harmonizing in the scope of forming the family and educating the offspring. On man rests the duty of providing by his labor for the means of keeping and educating the family; on woman that of regulating the household, and especially of educating the children.

“Some people will tell you,” said the Pope “that religion is good only for women. They mean that to be a sign of contempt for religion—but do you accept it in its positive part and remember that it is really only by the sentiment of religion that you can be of efficacious assistance to man, realize the responsibilities of being his helpmate and sown in the souls of your children that good seed which will make you great in them. Think how vast is your influence over man, whether as father, brother, husband, an influence summed up in the words of Scriptures. A good woman makes a good man. But do not think either that women’s duties are entirely confined within the circle of their families, for she has also a duty towards her neighbor, to dry his tears, to band together for the alleviation of the spiritual and temporal miseries of those who suffer, thus fulfilling a social mission which makes of her an angel of love amid human sorrows. I earnestly recommend, therefore, your union for the accomplishment of this social mission.

United you will be better able to attain the means necessary for the fulfillment of your duties to your families and to society. You will be well to increase and broaden your religious knowledge, for the catechism alone is not always sufficient to refute the errors that will come under your notice, and you will need a sound knowledge of the truths of religion in order to instruct your children and to rebut the charges that are being made against the Church. I would suggest also that you give serious attention to the study of pedagogy, so that you may learn the rules for the instruction of the young and become better equipped for the difficult work of education. To-day there is a tendency to spoil the child by sparing the rod and to act on the belief that children will grow up good Christians and good citizens when nurtured in softness and caresses. Then again, if you are to be good housewives you must learn something of the principles of domestic economy, which will enable you to regulate your households with thrift and order. But above all else, be assiduous in your religious duties, remembering that while the truly pious woman is the mistress of the house and becomes the base of both when she is without faith.”

It will be observed that the Holy Father gives due prominence to the work of woman in the social movement. He has not of course made any formal pronouncement on the political movement among women, but in more than one private or semiprivate conversation he has let it be clearly seen that he has no sympathy with the female demagogue or—indeed, for that matter, with the male demagogue of the hour. He does not wish to see women become members of Parliament or of Congress, but he does wish them to take an active and even a public part in questions connected intimately with the sanctity of the young, the betterment of the condition of the moral and material of working women, and so on.

Without The Children. Say, wouldn’t it be a weary world Without the wee child faces, Without the laughter from little lips, To ring through the lonesome places? Without the glance from the trusting eyes, Without the fond caresses When the sunset’s glist in the evening skies Is golden as shining tresses. Say, wouldn’t it be a dreary world, With noer a sleep song crooning, And drifting off to the jeweled skies In mellowed accents tuning? Without the pressure of tiny hands, Or the clasp of the rosy fingers, To lead us off to the mystic lands, Where dreaming fancy lingers. Say, wouldn’t it be a lonely world, Without the wee ones near us; Without the smiles and the prattle gay From the baby lips to cheer us? Ah, wouldn’t it be a gloomy place, Around and all above us, Without the sight of a dimpled face To warm our hearts and love us?—A. E. HARRINGTON, in Los Angeles Express.

CATHOLIC NOTES. Rev. James J. Conway, the well-known Jesuit educator, is dying at St. John’s Hospital, St. Louis, of cancer of the stomach. Father Conway has for years held the chair of ethics at St. Louis university. The Total Abstinence Society of St. John’s Newfoundland, recently held the half hundredth anniversary of its establishment. It now has over 1,000 men, including 600 juniors and over 400 hundred senior members. The fourth degree of the Knights of Columbus will be exemplified at Independence, Kan., May 31. Among the candidates will be Bishop Hennessy of Wichita and Bishop Meerseeckert of Oklahoma City. Lady Mand Barrett, younger daughter of the late Earl of Cavan, and sister of the present earl, has just entered the novitiate of the Canonesses Regular of St. Augustine at the English Convent, Bruges. Rev. Father John B. Eis, of Columbus, O., who speaks eight languages, is laboring for the conversion of the Jews. He has purchased at Worthville, O., the old seminary property and will convert it into a school for Jews. St. Mary’s Cathedral, Covington, Ky., is to have the largest cathedral window in the United States, and the second largest in the world. It will contain 1,500 square feet of glass, only 100 feet less than that in the cathedral at Mecklenburg, Prussia. The window will have sixteen large and sixteen small panels. It portays the life of the Blessed Virgin. The Royal Library at Berlin has just acquired a valuable manuscript at a cost of \$20,000. It is the “Book of Hours,” which formerly belonged to the Carolingian King, Lothair. It is on vellum, contains 468 pages and was produced by the monks of Tours. The illuminations are so fresh that it seems almost incredible that they were produced centuries ago. From Columbus, Ohio, comes a splendid record of Jesuit success. Fathers Boardman and Johnson, S. J., concluded a two weeks’ mission in that city and the result was 23 converts from Protestantism in the cathedral parish. A class of 50 took instruction and several more are expected to enter. A number of those who entered are of considerable local prominence. That the King James version of the New Testament is obsolete for critical purposes of the text was declared. This by Professor M. S. Terry of the Garrett Biblical Institute at the weekly meeting of Methodist ministers, Chicago. Search had been made, he said, through the libraries of Europe and Asia for original manuscripts, with the result that the text of the King James version had been found frequently erroneous. There are very few Catholic families in the little village of Voorheesville, N. Y. The correspondent of the Altamont Enterprise at that place thus refers to some recent residents of the village, and incidentally pays a tribute to the Church itself: “The McAvoy family left us Monday morning for their new home in Albany. Not having been greatly interested in either of our churches, they have not come closely in touch with our people. Yet this can be said of them: They have been good neighbors, good citizens, bringing up their children to be courteous and considerate. This is one of the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church to pay deference to seniority. It is gratifying to note that some of the work of the Catholic Federation is meeting with the encouragement of the leaders of non-Catholic bodies. Last month Rev. Dr. J. C. Jackson, a Methodist minister of Portsmouth, Ohio, delivered a splendid address under the auspices of the Federation and praised its crusade against the immoral theatre. National Director John H. Reddin of Denver has perfected a new ritual for the first, second and third degree initiation into the Knights of Columbus and his work has been accepted by the National Board of Directors. Considering that the Knights have for years been trying to depart from the ritual which has stood since the inception of the idea of an order such as now exists, and that nothing satisfactory has been available until Mr. Reddin’s work was presented to the National Board, his is a signal triumph and one which places his name large and bold on the pages of the annals of Knights of Columbus.