

perous, is now but a heap of ruins. Like Melrose Abbey, whose ruins tell the story of the ravages of the Huns of another age and country, Ypres will for centuries be a place of pilgrimage and an open book in the library of the world's heroism.

SOME FURTHER LETTERS

THE CANON'S IDEA OF CONTROVERSIAL "AUTHORITY."—CONFLICT OF STATEMENTS

To the Editor of The Advertiser: A rather lengthy absence from the city has prevented me from giving earlier attention to the attempt made by Canon Tucker in St. Paul's Cathedral on February 16 to justify the grave charges which I had asked him either to substantiate or to withdraw.

In an effort to escape responsibility for having aroused religious controversy in our midst, Canon Tucker makes this amazing statement:

"I courted no publicity, attacked no one, and made no reference to the Roman Catholic Church. It is a serious matter if a minister of the gospel is not free to instruct his own people. If not, where is there freedom of worship and of religion?"

This above statement is at direct variance with facts of public record. On February 3, Canon Tucker was reported in The Advertiser as having declared that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was "the greatest aberration in the history of Christendom," and that "the name of the Virgin was substituted for the name of Jesus Christ in the Te Deum and other services of the Catholic Church."

On February 4 Canon Tucker authorized the publication of the following statement:

"Canon Tucker declares that he did say that the whole Catholic doctrine of the Virgin Mary was directly contrary to the teachings of the Bible and the early church, and was the greatest aberration in the history of Christianity; and that in societies interested in promoting beliefs in her glories, her name had been substituted in psalms and in the Te Deum."

The Advertiser asserted its belief that there was no substantial difference between what was reported to have been said by Canon Tucker and his own version of his sermon. And in both The Advertiser's report and in Canon Tucker's own version there is a direct reference to the Catholic Church, and an attack on the beliefs of every Catholic.

I then challenged Canon Tucker to show proofs for his indefensible distortions of facts that are within the reach of all. What proofs has Canon Tucker produced? With a second-hand scholarship of which he should be ashamed, and which is far from establishing his boastful claim that he is "not a man to speak without knowledge and without authority, or to make false accusations and run away to avoid the consequences," the Canon brings forth a book entitled "Manual of Romanish Controversy," written by a Protestant minister named Rev. R. P. Blakeney. Does Canon Tucker not understand that the authority of the Rev. R. P. Blakeney is no better than his own? Can he fail to realize that such testimony would not be accepted by any court in the land? And the same criticism applies to every other authority adduced by Canon Tucker.

He might as well have offered as evidence against the Catholic Church "The Awful Dislosures of Maria Monk," or the files of the Orange Sentinel. If it is for that kind of a abuse that the Canon claims "freedom of worship and of religion," I have no desire to deprive him of any scrap of honor or of enjoyment that may accompany such an occupation.

And if he people find instruction in such abuse of the Catholic Church, I shall raise no objection so long as the performance is kept behind closed doors. But if, and whenever, it is reported in the public press, I shall assert the right of pinning the Canon down to proofs. I may be met, as in the present instance, by only shiftness and evasion. But at length I shall hope to show Canon Tucker in his true colors. For the Canon appears to have an itch for baseless misrepresentation.

Canon Tucker's misrepresentation and distortion of the teaching of the Catholic Church concerning the Blessed Virgin Mary recalls the amusing story of a Russian nobleman who was reported to have made a violent attack in Moscow on the British sovereign and the British constitution. This "foreign potentate," having asserted that the tenets of the British constitution were "atheistical," and its maxims "fendish," was called upon for proof. Whereupon, with an air of triumph that was intended to be overwhelming, he quoted from

Blackstone's "Commentaries on the laws of England." And this is what he read: "The King can do no wrong. In his political capacity there is ascribed to the King absolute perfection. The King is not only incapable of doing wrong, but even of thinking wrong; he can never do an improper thing; in him is no folly nor weakness." To make his case complete, the Russian cited Addison's line on Queen Anne: "Thee, Goddess, thee Britannia's Isle Adores." And then, with an exultant shriek, he cried out: "Was I not right my dear compatriots, in using the words fendish and atheistical with regard to the British sovereign and the British constitution?" To all of which, of course, there was but one reply: That the fiery orator, either in ignorance or in malice, had distorted and misrepresented Blackstone and Addison.

Canon Tucker is the local counter-part of the Russian nobleman.

M. F. FALLON, Bishop of London, London, March 1, 1919.

CANON INSISTS "ROMANISH CONTROVERSY" IS AUTHORITY

To the Editor of The Advertiser:

Bishop Fallon must have a very poor opinion of the intelligence of the people of London when he imagines that, with a mere stroke of the pen, he can rule out of court, as unworthy of credence, some of the best historians and writers of the nineteenth century. And it is precisely in a court of law that those distinguished names would carry weight; for I did not cite them as exponents of Roman doctrine, though even thus they are not to be lightly esteemed, but as witnesses to a fact. I stated what I thought to be a fact. Bishop Fallon denied it. I produced those witnesses to establish the fact. Dr. Blakeney, e.g., says: "The author of these pages has before him an edition of this Psalter of the Virgin, published in Rome in the year 1884, with the imprimatur of the Roman authorities." This is not a question of the truth or falsehood of Roman doctrine, but a simple question of fact. Either Dr. Blakeney had before him a copy of this Psalter or he had not. If he had all Bishop Fallon's brave words are but empty sounds. If he had not, then he convicts himself as a deliberate and willful liar. It will take more than Bishop Fallon's mere ipse dixit to place in that category such men as Archbishop Trench and Dean Milman.

Then Bishop Fallon recalls an incident that occurred two years ago, and adds: "The Canon appears to have an itch for baseless misrepresentation. I have caught him at it before." It was at the time when Father Richards was reported to have made the statement that "marriage by the Anglican Church or by any other denomination of the Protestant Church, is no marriage at all in the sight of God." In the course of an interview with The Advertiser on the subject, I attributed to Bishop Fallon, from the report of a sermon preached by him some time before the statement, "Outside the Roman Catholic Church there is no salvation." My statement, however, as appeared in The Advertiser in the following form: "there is no salvation for anyone outside the Romanish Church." To this statement Bishop Fallon objected. This led to a correspondence that will serve to establish the facts of the case.

1. It was not my words which the Bishop objected to, but those of the reporter. December 12, 1916, I wrote to the Bishop saying: "The item was the result of an interview over the telephone. I am not responsible for the wording of the report."

To this the Bishop replied December 14: "I accept without reserve, your denial of responsibility for the wording of the report." It is on the strength of that report that the Bishop now charges me with "baseless misrepresentation." The charge lies at the Bishop's own door.

2. My statement was "outside the Roman Catholic Church there is no salvation." This may be proved by a letter which I addressed to The Advertiser December 18, 1916. What does the correspondence reveal? December 19, the Bishop wrote:

"Outside the Church there is no salvation." I have caught him at it before. Two years ago he publicly asserted that "Bishop Fallon announced a year ago there was no salvation for anyone outside the Roman Church." As a result of my private request that the Canon inform me when and where I had used such language, he published a half-hearted retraction in which he expressed regret "if he misunderstood my words." Wherein the fact was that I had never used words susceptible of any such interpretation nor could Canon Tucker find in the public press to which he appealed any semblance of justification for the charge he had so impudently made, but which he had neither the manliness nor the sense of public decency to withdraw unreservedly.

Canon Tucker's misrepresentation and distortion of the teaching of the Catholic Church concerning the Blessed Virgin Mary recalls the amusing story of a Russian nobleman who was reported to have made a violent attack in Moscow on the British sovereign and the British constitution. This "foreign potentate," having asserted that the tenets of the British constitution were "atheistical," and its maxims "fendish," was called upon for proof. Whereupon, with an air of triumph that was intended to be overwhelming, he quoted from

Fallon something regarding his own Church which he never knew before, and he returns the compliment by saying that my ignorance of the teaching of his Church is "colossal." I am, yours most truly,

L. NORMAN TUCKER, The Rectory, St. Paul's Cathedral, London, March 10, 1919.

BISHOP INSISTS ON PROOF.—GARBLED LETTERS TO BE PUBLISHED

To the Editor of The Advertiser:

I consider that Canon Tucker, in his latest communication to you, has garbled the contents and distorted the meaning of certain letters that passed between him and me some two years ago. In consequence I have asked his consent to the publication of the entire correspondence. As it is too lengthy to expect that it should be given space in the columns of the daily press, I propose to issue and circulate it in pamphlet form, and let it speak for itself.

Some weeks ago Canon Tucker stated that "the whole Catholic doctrine of the Virgin Mary was directly contrary to the teachings of the Bible," that "leaders of the Catholic Church have been ascribing to her the attributes of Christ himself," and that "her name has been substituted in Psalms and in the Te Deum for the name of Christ."

Canon Tucker thereby revived the old slander and calumny that the Catholic Church gives supreme honor or divine worship to the Virgin Mary. If he did not mean that, then what possible purpose could his words serve? If he did not mean that, what did he mean? And if he did mean to charge Catholics with idolatry, then it would have been the part of honesty for him to have said so frankly. How he has been understood is well illustrated by a correspondent who signs himself "Onlooker," and who refers to Canon Tucker's charges as representing "what is commonly known by those outside the Roman Church as mariolatry." Did Canon Tucker really mean to accuse Catholics of mariolatry?

When I requested Canon Tucker to substantiate his statements, I naturally expected him to produce proofs from Catholic sources. We have our authentic and authorized catechisms, prayer books, missals, breviaries, doctrinal treatises, works of devotion and books of liturgy. They are to be found by the hundred here in the city of London where Canon Tucker's charges have been publicly made. All the services in Catholic churches are open to all, we welcome inquiry and are ever ready to explain our doctrines. We claim, perhaps not unreasonably, that we know our beliefs better than those who are strangers to the Catholic faith; we object, perhaps not without reason, to have Protestant writers offered as authorities of Catholic teaching.

In answer to my challenge, what course did Canon Tucker pursue? Did he offer as justification or proof one iota of Catholic teaching? Most assuredly not. He produced a book, written in 1884, by a Protestant minister, and the very title of which "Manual of Romanish Controversy" would render its contents suspect to any fair minded man. In point of fact and law such testimony is inadmissible in any court; it is precisely equivalent to hearsay evidence. The addition of the names of Milman, Trench and others does not add a particle of strength to the argument. The only competent evidence is authentic Catholic doctrine. That evidence Canon Tucker has not produced, and cannot produce. And hence I repeat my accusation that he has made baseless charges, and has misrepresented and distorted Catholic teaching.

Let me submit to Canon Tucker and to your readers a parallel case. A London newspaper, we suppose, quotes Bishop Fallon as having said in St. Peter's Cathedral:

"It would not be considered heresy in the Church of England for the Archbishop of Canterbury to deny the existence of God."

Canon Tucker at once vigorously protests and calls upon me to prove so monstrous a charge. Instead of referring to the recognized doctrinal formularies of the Anglican Church, I produce a book entitled "The Comedies of Convocation," written in 1884, by A. F. Marshall, a graduate of Cambridge, and from it I quote: "We find that the Church of England is not opposed to the existence of a God. At the same time, we cannot overlook the fact that the nineteenth century, in affirming that all churches, even the apostolic, have erred in matters of faith, obviously implies that the Church of England may err in teaching that there is a God. We conclude, that whilst, on the one hand, the archbishop has taken an extreme or one-sided view of the teaching of the Church; on the other, for the reason assigned, it is undoubtedly open to every (Anglican) clergyman either to believe in or to deny the existence of a God."

What would Canon Tucker think of my "controversial decency and honesty"? "The Comedies of Convocation" is a satirical attack on the Church of England. Its author is a convert from Anglicanism to the Catholic Church. Would Canon Tucker consider him a competent witness? Is his testimony admissible on a point of doctrine of the Church of England? Or is it only the Catholic Church against which such untruthful, unfair and shameful controversial methods may be used with impunity?

M. F. FALLON, Bishop of London, London, March 14, 1919.

THE CANON SUMMONS ROBERT E. SPEER AS A WITNESS!

Editor Free Press: Bishop Fallon writes me a very angry letter. He certainly is a mighty poor logician, unless, indeed, as "Onlooker" says, he merely wishes to throw dust in people's eyes.

I quoted an accurate and serious author, Dr. Blakeney, who says in effect, I hold in my hands a Roman Catholic Psalter, published in Rome in 1884, with the imprimatur of the papal authorities, with the name of the Virgin substituted for that of God, and I quoted as corroborative evidence Archbishop French, Dean Milman, Archdeacon Hardwick and others.

How does Bishop Fallon meet this? He says, let me submit a parallel case. He then proceeds to quote a facetious graduate of Cambridge, A. F. Marshall by name, who writes the satirical attack on the Church of England, entitled "The Comedies of Convocation," and concludes with the words, "It is undoubtedly open to every (Anglican) clergyman either to believe in or to deny the existence of God." By the same process of reasoning this would be equally true of every Presbyterian, Methodist and Baptist minister.

Let me point out to Bishop Fallon that this is by no means a parallel case. To make it a parallel case the Bishop would have to quote not a satirical comedian, but John Henry Newman or some other serious Roman Catholic author, not as giving his own views, but as saying, "I hold in my hand a Church of England book, published by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, with the imprimatur of the Archbishop of Canterbury, which contains the following statement: 'It is undoubtedly open to every clergyman either to believe in or to deny the existence of God,' and that he supported this with the corroboration of Cardinal Manning, Cardinal Wiseman and Cardinal Vaughan. There would be a strong presumption, not to say a certainty, that such a book existed and that it represented, in some measure, the teaching of the Church of England. This would be not only a parallel case, but a very strong and perfectly legitimate argument. In the other case, to be very frank, I think as little of Bishop Fallon's "controversial decency and honesty" as I think of his logic.

The Bishop asks me if I really mean to accuse Roman Catholics of mariolatry. I have no desire to use the word if it is offensive. But let me again quote a serious writer, Robert E. Speer, one of the outstanding figures in the religious world today. Dr. Speer spent months in investigating conditions in South America, where he studied all classes and conditions of men and institutions. He calls South America a Roman Catholic continent, where "Protestantism is not existent, practically and where the Roman Catholic Church has held undisputed sway for three centuries. After describing the deplorable moral condition that widely prevails among priests and people alike, in a book entitled "South America Problems," he mentions one of the causes as follows: "The great mass of South American people have not been given Christianity. The very crucifixes of which South America is full misrepresent the Gospel. They show a dead man, not a living Saviour. And even the dead Christ is a subordinate figure. The central place is Mary's. Mary is the central religious person. She, as Bishop Romero declared in the Argentine congress on December 31, 1901, for all Catholics is the centre of piety and virtue in the family circle. Mary, not Christ, and Mariolatry is the religion of the land because the Church has taught it as true Christianity. When on Good Friday morning, 1910, the two processions bearing the images of Mary and Jesus moved out of the church of San Nicola, in Barranquilla, the multitude followed the figure of Mary, and the crucifix of the Saviour was deserted. The popular religion of South America accepts the view of Mary, which is set forth in St. Alphonsus Liguori's 'Glories of Mary'—if Jesus is the king of the universe, Mary is also its queen, and, as queen, she possesses, by right, the whole kingdom of her son. Hence as many creatures as there are who serve God, so many there are who serve Mary; and she is in heaven and all things that are in heaven and on earth are subject to the Empire of God, so are they also under the dominion of Mary. In the great La Merced Church, in Lima, over the altar is the motto, 'Gloria a Maria.' And in the wall of the ancient Jesuit church at Cuzco, known as the Church of the Campana are cut the words, 'Come up to Mary all ye who are burdened and weary with your sins and she will give you rest.'"

It would seem that Mariolatry is not too strong a word to qualify such a state of things.

I am yours most truly

L. NORMAN TUCKER, The Rectory, St. Paul's Cathedral, London, March 17, 1919.

WITH SPURIOUS PSALTER AND FORGED ENCYCICAL CANON IS LEFT IN BAD COMPANY

Editor, Free Press: After squirming for six weeks Canon Tucker finally admits that the charge he levelled against Catholics in St. Paul's Cathedral on the 3rd of Feb. last, was identical. For his identity and identity are synonymous terms. Being a gentleman, of course, it hurts

Canon Tucker to use the word "if it be offensive," but as a dignitary of the Anglican church and rector of St. Paul's Cathedral, he must instruct his congregation, and "it would seem that mariolatry is not too strong a word" to impart such instruction. Too polite to libel an individual Catholic, yet Canon Tucker does not consider it bad manners to slander them in bulk. And to justify his weird notion of "instruction," he invokes the principle of freedom of speech. "If," asks Canon Tucker, "a minister of religion is not free to instruct his congregation on religious matters, where then is freedom of speech, of teaching or of worship?" The obligation not to bear false witness is, to say the least, as sacred as the principle of freedom of speech. That obligation Canon Tucker has shamelessly violated.

Now, Canon Tucker has accused Catholics of being idolaters, let us examine the basis upon which he rests so foul a charge. His first argument is drawn from a book, "Manual of Romanish Controversy," by Rev. R. P. Blakeney, a Protestant minister, whom Canon Tucker canonizes as "an accurate and serious author." Dr. Blakeney quotes from a "Psalter of Mary," by St. Bonaventure. The British Museum Catalogue, an authority that even Canon Tucker will scarcely question, characterizes this alleged "Psalter of Mary" as "spurious." Your readers may choose between Canon Tucker on the one hand and the British Museum Catalogue on the other.

In his dash to South America Canon Tucker is still more unfortunate. In this case his faithful navigator is again another Protestant minister, the Rev. Robert E. Speer, whom he vouches for as "a serious writer, one of the outstanding figures in the religious world today." Permit me to throw a little light on the reliability of this "outstanding figure."

On April 27, 1910, the Rev. Robert E. Speer delivered a lecture before a missionary convention in Cincinnati, on "Our Duty to Our Benighted Brethren of South America." This lecture had been previously delivered in Rochester, N. Y. On both occasions the Rev. Mr. Speer repeated his slanders against Catholics of the South American continent, and quoted as his justification therefor a pastoral letter of the Archbishop of Venezuela, and an Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII., to the clergy of Chile. It took more than two years to force the Rev. Robert E. Speer to acknowledge that the documents he had used were forgeries. On Oct. 18, 1910, this outstanding figure in the religious world was informed that Rome had pronounced the Encyclical in question "a palpable fraud and forgery," and that the Archbishop of Venezuela had styled his alleged pastoral "a wicked and vile calumny, a course fraud." It was only on the 30th of April, 1912, that Rev. Robert E. Speer, in a letter over his own signature, admitted the forgery. He made no apology for his unspeakable offense, but with a callous disregard for decency, expressed his pleasure that "the matter had been definitely settled, not only by the statement of the secretary of the archbishop but also by the acknowledgment of the part of the original inventor." Meanwhile the vile calumny had been given wide publicity by Dr. Beach, a professor in Yale University, and by Dr. Ward, editor of the New York Independent.

Thus the latest charge of mariolatry against Catholics rests on the authority of the Rev. W. P. Blakeney, who makes use of a "spurious" work; of the Rev. Robert E. Speer, a circulator of "a palpable forgery, a wicked and vile calumny, a course fraud," and of the Rev. L. Norman Tucker, canon of the Anglican church and rector of St. Paul's Cathedral.

Canon Tucker's indefensible and similarly baseless falsehood was exposed some years ago by the late Cardinal Newman. On that occasion the culprit was also a minister of the Church of England. He had been on a visit to Belgium, and, on his return, made the following declaration which was reported in the London Times in June 1851: "On my visit to Brussels I was led to inspect the door of St. Gudule's Cathedral: I saw fastened upon there a catalogue of sins with a specification of the price at which remission of each might severally be obtained." On investigation it was found that there was indeed a catalogue fastened to the door of St. Gudule's Cathedral. The inscription translated ran as follows: "A chair without cushion, one cent; a chair with cushion, two cents. On great festival days, a chair without cushion, two cents; a chair with cushion, four cents."

It is not on record that either the London Times or the Anglican minister made an apology. It looks as though Canon Tucker was running true to form.

M. F. FALLON, Bishop of London.

P. S.—Would it be an indiscretion to request the anonymous letter writers "Onlooker," and "Bystander," to reveal their real identity? Their style and matter arouse my curiosity and suspicion.

London, March 20, 1919.

Satisfaction puts the brakes on progress. A gentleman never heard a story before.

It was a good old woman who had known all the hard knocks of the world who said, "Honey, don't worry, don't fret, never give up until you get such a hard knock it makes a hole in your shadow."

THE ONLY ANTIDOTE

A little more than a hundred years ago a Democratic statesman, whose name is often on Democratic lips and whose main theories and principles of government the Democratic Party has wholly rejected, expressed these moderate, sensible, and sound opinions upon a subject of living interest and importance to the United States of 1919:

"I rejoice, as a moralist, at the prospect of a reduction of the duties on wine by our National Legislature. It is an error to view a tax on that liquor as merely a tax on the rich. It is a prohibition of its use to the middle class of our citizens, and a condemnation of them to the poison of whisky, which is desolating their houses. No nation is drunken where wine is cheap, and none sober where the dearth of wine substitutes ardent spirits as the common beverage. It is truth, the only beverage to the base of whisky. Fix but the duty at the rate of other merchandise, and we can drink wine here as cheap as we do grog, and who will not prefer it? Its extended use will carry health and comfort to a much enlarged circle. Every one in easy circumstances (as the bulk of our citizens are) will prefer it to the poison to which they are now driven by their Government. And the Treasury itself will find that a penny apiece from a dozen is more than a groat from a single one."

So Thomas Jefferson wrote to Mr. de Neuville, 1818. His judgment of the distinction that should be made between mild and strong drink might be contemporary. In the last sixty odd years beer has become the cheapest and commonest beverage of small and moderate consumption. He could not foresee, he could not imagine, that a party which still effects to honor him as its founder and saint would so utterly forget or deny him as to attempt, not a partial prohibition of healthful and comforting drink by means of the taxing power, but a total prohibition whose inevitable result will be the extension and multiplication of the base of illicit whisky. Today Mr. Jefferson would write that "no nation is drunken where beer is cheap, and no nation sober where the prohibition of beer and wine substitutes ardent spirits as the common beverage." That the Treasury loses a billion of revenue, and States and municipalities an immense sum; that Federal prohibition is an interference with private habit and a flouting of State and local rights is inconceivable to Mr. Jefferson, is plain to everybody. That the Government is driving its citizens to "poison" is plain to everybody but the irreconcilable Dry.

Mr. Jefferson's words are commended particularly to his own party, because it has sinned against its own traditions and the great name it loves to invoke. To thoughtful men of every party those words, weighed today as they were a century ago, visualize the folly and the danger of attempting absolute prohibition.—N. Y. Times.

WILL FRANCE RENEW WAR ON RELIGIOUS

WOUNDED PRIESTS, WHO WON DECORATIONS FOR BRAVERY IN BATTLE, MAY BE EXILED AGAIN

C. P. A. Service

Paris, February, 13.—Unhappily signs are not wanting that the present French Government purposes to renew, at no distant date, the persecution of the religious orders, which one imagined the war had made a thing of the past. The Minister of the Interior, M. Faure, has written to the prefect of Tarn, demanding to know if a certain missionary, advertised to preach at a church in Albi, is not concealing under the title of a diocesan missionary that he is a member of the dissolved order of the Regular Tertiaries of St. Francis of Assisi. He states these existed at Ambiatot Tarn, in 1901, and he asked the prefect to discover if there are members of this dissolved congregation about.

A Paris advocate has also stated that he has in hand processes against several religious, accused of reconstructing their congregation.

This is a fine return for the religious, who, though exiled, rushed from all parts of the world at the first call of France in distress. Are those who survive, their breasts covered with decorations and their bodies scarred with wounds, to take again the hard road of exile, now that their patriotic work is done? Yet, according to the letter of M. Faure, late head of M. Combes' Cabinet, this great act of ingratitude is already in process of being put into execution.

DISQUIETUDE IN ALSACE LORRAINE

In Alsace Lorraine there is also disquieting news of a similar character. The hopes of Lorrainers raised by the robust optimism of Canon Collin, were based on the solemn declaration of Marshal Joffre, of the Government and of M. Poincaré. But now the first act to follow on these words causes not renewed hopes but alarm and dismay. Debiere, a leading Freemason, who has been charged with the task of studying the cultural question, has declared that the time has arrived for the separation of Church and State and the laicization of the schools and their personnel in both the recovered provinces.

Have more than thou showest; speak less than thou knowest; spend less than thou owest.

Flowers Fade

Recently in a distant City we saw upon the walls of a church, within full view of the congregation, a temporary "honor roll" of those of their number who had responded to their Country's call.

Fastened on the wall at the bottom of this roll was a vase containing flowers, which some loving heart and faithful hands changed weekly.

The thought which prompted this was beautiful.

There comes the other thought, however, that "flowers fade" and such loving hearts themselves pass away.

Believing that there is scarcely a church, college, lodge, or corporation that would not wish to perpetuate the memory of its fallen brave in a more permanent form, we are now furnishing "Memorial Tablets" of a very high order in Bronze and other materials.

Those already supplied by us range from \$35.00 to almost \$1,000.00.

As the designing and manufacturing of these are done entirely by our own staff, both high quality and moderate cost are assured.

Designs and estimates cheerfully submitted without any obligation whatever upon your part.

Ryrie Bros.
Limited
134-136-138 Yonge St.,
TORONTO

FATHER FRASER'S CHINA MISSION FUND

Dear Friends,—I came to Canada to seek vocations for the Chinese Missions which are greatly in need of priests. In my parish alone there are three cities and a thousand villages to be evangelized and only two priests. Since I arrived in Canada a number of youths have expressed their desire to study for the Chinese mission but there are no funds to educate them. I appeal to your charity to assist in founding bursaries for the education of those and others who desire to become missionaries in China. Five thousand dollars will found a bursary. The interest on this amount will support a student. When he is ordained and goes off to the mission another will be taken in and so on forever. All imbued with the Catholic spirit of propagating the Faith to the ends of the earth will, I am sure, contribute generously to this fund.

Gratefully yours in Jesus and Mary,
J. M. FRASER.

I propose the following bursaries for subscription.

SACRED HEART BURSE

Previously acknowledged.....	\$2,045 92
A Friend of the Sacred Heart, Newcastle.....	2 50
W. E. Trainor, Charlotte-town.....	1 00
Alex. J. McLellan, Rear Dunvegan.....	2 00
M. F. A. St. John's, Nfld.....	1 00
M. A. M., Norris Arm, Nfld.....	10 00
Denis Ryan, Little Paradise, Nfld.....	5 00
J. F. O'NE, Bay de Verde.....	20 00
R. G. McIsaac, Sydney.....	2 00

QUEEN OF APOSTLES BURSE

Previously acknowledged.....	\$1,380 48
St. John's Church, Almonte.....	91 85

ST. ANTHONY'S BURSE

Previously acknowledged.....	\$167 70
------------------------------	----------

IMMACULATE CONCEPTION BURSE

Previously acknowledged.....	\$248 00
------------------------------	----------

COMPONTER OF THE AFFLICTED BURSE

Previously acknowledged.....	\$67 00
------------------------------	---------

ST. JOSEPH, PATRON OF CHINA, BURSE

Previously acknowledged.....	\$867 07
------------------------------	----------

BLESSED SACRAMENT BURSE

Previously acknowledged.....	\$81 50
------------------------------	---------

ST. FRANCIS XAVIER BURSE

Previously acknowledged.....	\$210 80
------------------------------	----------

HOLY NAME OF JESUS BURSE

Previously acknowledged.....	\$74 00
Friend, St. John's, Nfld.....	5 00

HOLY SOULS BURSE

Previously acknowledged.....	\$181 00
P. Kearns, Barrie.....	5 00

LITTLE FLOWER BURSE

Previously acknowledged.....	\$128 15
------------------------------	----------