

CARDINAL BOURNE'S SILVER JUBILEE

A REMARKABLE DIFFERENCE IN
ATTITUDE TOWARD CHURCH
AS COMPARED WITH
WISEMAN'S DAY

By H. C. Watts
London Correspondent N. C. W. C.

London, May 10.—From all parts of the world telegrams and letters have poured into the Archbishop's House at Westminster congratulating Cardinal Bourne on the silver jubilee of his consecration to the episcopate. These messages come from the Supreme Head of the Universal Church, from ruling sovereigns and ambassadors and from prominent personages who are not Catholics. That is the personal side of Cardinal Bourne's episcopal jubilee. But besides all this there is a wider aspect, that which concerns the present position of the Catholic Church in England, and this is found in the attitude of the British non-Catholic secular press towards Cardinal Bourne and the occasion of his jubilee.

To understand what has happened it is necessary to go back some years: to the year 1850, when Pope Pius IX. restored the Catholic hierarchy to the English, Scottish and Wales; to the year when Cardinal Wiseman, who had just then been appointed the first Archbishop of Westminster, addressed his famous first pastoral as Archbishop to the faithful from the Flammarion Gate in Rome. That pastoral was greeted by the British press with cries of derision and howls of rage. The whole machinery of political intrigue was set in motion, and the Government passed the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, which not only aimed at depriving the new Catholic Bishops of territorial titles, but sought to deprive them of the title to ecclesiastical property and to render their judicial acts null and void.

That was in 1851, when the Catholic Church was looked upon as something that might be easily and effectively killed by a strong and united press publicity.

A REMARKABLE CHANGE

But what is the position today, in 1921, exactly seventy years later? The same journals that fanned at the mouth over Cardinal Wiseman have given their columns to celebrate the episcopal jubilee of Cardinal Bourne, the fourth occupant of that same decided See of Westminster.

"Never," says the Daily Telegraph in a column length article, "has the Roman Catholic Church, during the last three hundred years, been in a stronger position in this country than it is today and never has it made more rapid strides in the course of any period of eighteen years, than it has made in the eighteen years which have passed since Cardinal Bourne came to Westminster."

The Times, the old "Thunderer," which even in these days is not unwilling occasionally to indulge in "Pope-baiting," can bring itself to say: "Two virtues seem conspicuous in the Cardinal's character—courage and an intense patriotism. Frankly, the Chief Pastor of what Archbishop Benson (of Canterbury) used to call 'the Italian Mission' in England needs both. We have not travelled so far as might be wished from the outskirts which followed Wiseman's famous letter from the Flammarion Gate. . . . Ecclesiastical, like politicians, are prone to sit on fences, which often break down under them, but this has never been Cardinal Bourne's habit."

The Morning Post, endowed both by nature and by grace with the provision of seeing politics even when the Pope sneezes, says: "As Archbishop of Westminster he (Cardinal Bourne) has a twofold office to bear, first as ruler of his own diocese, but beyond that he is the official and acknowledged head of the Hierarchy in this country, and the spokesman of the Catholic body before the Civil Government. In this capacity it may fairly be said that the Cardinal has meted a place in the eyes of the British people, not by any sensational achievement, but by solid and faithful service to the Church and State, and he has thereby won the regard of both people and Government."

WHAT SEVENTY YEARS HAVE DONE

Seventy years ago these journals would have packed off Cardinals, bishops and priests, bag and baggage, to the foreign parts to which their spiritual ministrations were understood in the English mind to be suited!

Underlying Cardinal Bourne's jubilee there is something far wider in its significance even than the twenty fifth anniversary of the episcopal consecration of a distinguished Prince of the Church. The Reformation in England is not yet entirely undone, perhaps it will never be. But during the eighteen years that the Cardinal has ruled at Westminster things have come to pass that must have been well-nigh undreamed of when Wiseman first took possession of his See. The first great function that took place in the new Cathedral of Westminster was the enthronement of Archbishop Bourne, who paid off the debt, placed in the crypt the bodies of the first two Cardinals of Westminster, Wiseman and Manning, and consecrated the Cathedral amid a scene of liturgical splendor almost unparalleled in the ecclesiastical history of Europe.

During Cardinal Bourne's episcopate which began in this month of May twenty-five years ago, the late

King Edward VIII., defying English Nonconformity and Low Church Protestantism which he hated as much as he could hate anything, attended in state at the Spanish Church in London a solemn Requiem Mass for the murdered King of Portugal, and took his part in the function with those rites prescribed by the Roman Ritual when a Sovereign is present at Mass. When Edward VII. died and George V. came to the throne, the anti-Catholic and to Catholic minds at all events blasphemous oath against Transubstantiation which the Constitution requires the Sovereign to take at his Coronation was, if not abrogated, at least materially altered that its insulting sting was removed. This precious heritage from the Protestant William of Orange apparently has gone for ever.

A DIPLOMATIC TRIUMPH

The great Eucharistic Congress of 1908, when Premier Asquith in deference to the Nonconformist conscience forbade the Blessed Sacrament being carried in procession through the streets of Westminster, was, through the diplomacy of Cardinal Bourne, ultimately a Catholic triumph. For while Cardinal Vanutelli was unable, in his character of a priest, to carry the blessed Sacrament in the monstrance through the streets, the loss of this religious consolation was almost compensated for by the political significance of that Cardinal walking through London in his character of Papal Legate and publicly bestowing his benediction.

The blood of the English Martyrs, the tears of the oppressed Catholics of the penal days, the sweat and toil of those who labored for Catholic emancipation, have all come to fruition in these days. An English Cardinal is now the Delegate of the Apostolic See for the Catholic affairs of the British Navy, and is recognized in that capacity by the Government. He has lived to see one of his fellow countrymen consecrated to the episcopate as Military Bishop of the British Army and Air Force; and within the precincts of the Vatican itself finds an English Catholic layman accredited as British Minister to the Holy See; and for the first time a Catholic appointed as Irish Viceroy.

Perhaps in a country that has never lost the Faith these things are not quite so full of meaning as they are to us here in England. But today, at all events, I think that I understand what the jubilee of our Cardinal Archbishop really means.

WHERE LAST MARTYR SUFFERED

This Sunday afternoon of May Day I stood outside Hyde Park in London, at the Marble Arch, on a triangular plate that is left into the roadway. Two hundred and forty years ago, on July 1, 1681, that very spot ran red with the blood of Blessed Oliver Plunkett, Archbishop of Armagh, who, surrounded by the police of his time, was put to death here at Tyburn because he was a Catholic.

As I stood on the spot that was reddened by the martyr's blood there swept by a procession of thousands of Catholics making their annual pilgrimage along the Martyr's Way from Newgate to Tyburn. The procession passed along a little to the left, and then the host of the faithful stopped and fell on their knees before a dingy house facing the park. The police of today were there keeping order; every head was uncovered; there was dead silence, and from the balcony of the dingy house, which is the convent of the Tyburn nuns, the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster gave Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament to the kneeling thousands, within eight of the spot where the last of the martyrs in this country shed his blood for the Faith.

CATHOLIC FUNERALS

DENIED TO THOSE WHO HAD
DENIED THE FAITH

Chicago, Ill., May 20.—For the second time within the year, the advertised plan of the friends of a dead political leader not known as a practical Catholic, to hold a spectacular funeral in a Catholic church, has been blocked by Archbishop George W. Mundelein.

To the surprise of some thousands of mourners and curiosity seekers, the funeral cortege of Anthony D'Andrea, slain political and radical leader, leaving his late home in Ashland Boulevard, did not turn toward the Church of Our Lady of Pompeii, last Monday morning, nor did it lead to the Catholic cemetery of Mount Olivet, as had been announced. Instead a brother of the dead man, a Catholic priest, performed a brief ceremony on the steps of the home, and the body was taken to Mount Greenwood, a general cemetery.

The church is too small for the crowd, was the announcement made to the throng, which included many public officials and politicians, but to the newspapers the family of the deceased said:

"The Archbishop had forbidden the Church ceremony, and the consecrated grave."

"D'Andrea was not a Catholic," said the Rt. Rev. Monsignor E. J. Hoban, D.D., Chancellor. "We did not deny him the right to be buried from a Catholic Church and in a consecrated grave. He did not have that right."

D'Andrea, who was a political, labor, and fraternity leader, was shot down at his door-way, presumably as the result of the feud in his ward, which already had resulted in several

killings. The announcement made that he was to have a big funeral at the Catholic Church and at the Catholic cemetery naturally aroused considerable comment. That there had been no right on the part of any one to make such plans, was made plain by the chancellor's statement.

The newspaper files of two decades ago, throw additional light on the ruling of the Archbishop. They show that about that time, D'Andrea was ordained by the self-styled "Bishop" Anthony Kozlowski, head of the so-called Independent Catholic Church, on the northwest side of the city, whose actions caused much trouble and no little litigation and scandal. This act out D'Andrea off from the Catholic Church.

Several months ago "Jim" Colismo, also a political leader, was slain and announcement was made that he was to have a big funeral in a Catholic Church, preceded by a parade. The church services did not take place.

SEPARATE SCHOOLS

STATESMANLIKE ADDRESS BY
HON. W. M. MARTIN, PREMIER
OF SASKATCHEWAN

Northwest Review

Speaking in Saskatoon, on May 14th, Premier Martin gave his views on the School Question and admonished the sectarian bigots and fomenters of strife who inject animosity into our political life and retard the development of a united Canada.

He spoke as a Canadian premier should speak and we think it will be found that in his survey of the situation he adhered to actual facts with a dignity and precision unhappily too infrequent but which to our mind is true to the spirit of the real Canada.

We give the following synopsis of the Premier's address:

It is a matter of great regret to me that an effort is again being made to create an issue out of the school question. A discussion of this question always causes racial and religious prejudices to arise and I hoped during the past few years that it would not be necessary again to deal with the subject in public addresses. In this hope I have apparently been disappointed for it appears that there are still a lot of our people who desire to raise the issue again. Those who feel so disposed are entitled to their opinions and I am prepared to debate the subject with them but I would much prefer it if they would come out into the open in order that the public might see who they are and not adopt the submarine method of warfare which has been used in this connection in the Province during the past few months.

ALWAYS SCHOOL QUESTIONS

There have always been school questions in Canada: in fact such questions have been a curse to the country. A very interesting statement appeared very recently in the press written by Hon. T. A. Cresser, Leader of the National Progressive Party in the House of Commons. That statement is as follows:

"No country needs for its successful welding into a true nation such a measure of mutual toleration among its different racial elements as this Canada of ours, and no country has been so cursed in the past by cowardly unprincipled appeals to racial passions and religious prejudices. As long as appeals to these vices were the staple currency of our political life, it was equally hopeless to dream of any sane discussion of our grave economic and social problems or any progress to decent national idealism. But happily that unpleasant atmosphere has either disappeared or is disappearing and it is not unlikely that the Canadian people will visit with prompt punishment such mischiefmakers as seek to revive it, for they have no greater enemy."

For my own part I have always felt that the only way to deal with such questions was to deal with them in a spirit of fairness and moderation for, otherwise, no settlement is possible. British policy for centuries has been one of fair treatment of minorities. In Canada the same course must be pursued; if it is not, I fear for the future of my own province.

WITHOUT THE SEPARATE SCHOOLS
CONFEDERATION WOULD HAVE
BEEN IMPOSSIBLE

The history of Separate schools in Canada dates back to pre-Confederation days and the question was of such importance in the negotiations leading up to Confederation that those who were responsible for the drafting of the British North America Act put in the law section 93, which gives educational autonomy to each province subject to the protection of minority rights.

I need not tell you that the reason for the existence of this section was not only the protection of the rights possessed by the Catholic minority in the Province of Ontario, but also for the purpose of the protection of the Protestant minority in the Province of Quebec, whose representatives were most insistent that they should have the same privileges bestowed on them as the Catholic minority enjoyed in the Province of Ontario. Without this Section, the Confederation would not have been possible, and the leading men in Canada at that time of all political persuasion were prepared in the interests of the whole of Canada to

reach a conclusion which would be fair to both the Protestant minority in Quebec and the Catholic minority in the Province of Ontario.

In 1905, Saskatchewan and Alberta were made provinces by acts passed by the Dominion Parliament under powers conferred on that Parliament by the British North America Act of 1871.

The Saskatchewan Act made provision for the Constitution of Saskatchewan, for the Administration of the Province, and for the passing of laws for the peace, order, and good government of the Province and perpetuated the rights and privileges of the minorities, whether Catholic or Protestant, possessed under the provisions of Chapters 29 and 30 of the Ordinances of the North-West Territories passed in the year 1901, privileges which had been in force in Territorial days for many years, providing for the establishment of Separate schools, whether Catholic or Protestant, and I think I may say the system in Territorial days operated very satisfactorily, and, in the judgment of the Parliament of Canada, 1905, the enactment constituted a happy solution of a vexed question.

Minority rights, whether Protestant or Catholic, are exactly the same today as they were prior to 1905. No change has been made in the Section of the School Act in so far as minority rights are concerned and it is the policy of the Government to administer the law in this regard as it was fixed by the Constitution given us in 1905.

To my mind it is a question which was settled by the people of Saskatchewan and the people of Canada long ago.

CANNOT ALTER CONSTITUTION

The question, however, has again been raised and the Provincial Legislature has been asked to abolish Separate schools. Our Constitution was given us by the Federal Parliament under power conferred upon them by the British North America Act of 1871. Obviously, unless it is stated in such Constitution that the Province has power to change the law, no such power exists. The Federal Parliament itself cannot change the Constitution because the power given the Federal Parliament under the British North America Act of 1871 only extends to the giving of a Constitution to the new Province and it is expressly provided in section 6 of that Act that once a Province is erected the Parliament of Canada cannot subsequently change the Constitution given. The Imperial Parliament alone has the power to change the educational clauses of the Anatomy Act.

Statements made from time to time would lead people who are not informed to believe that Separate schools districts in the Province have increased very fast. As a matter of fact the contrary is the case. When the Province was established in 1905 there were 834 school districts in the Province of which 9 were Separate school districts, or about 1% of the total. At the present time there are roughly speaking, 4,500 school districts in the Province of which 21 are Separate school districts or less than 1%. During the time that I have been a member of the Government of Saskatchewan, a period now of between four and five years, there have been three Separate school districts organized, two Roman Catholic districts and one Protestant district and during the same time there was an amalgamation of Public school and Separate school districts at Windhorst.

SEPARATE SCHOOLS REALLY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

There is another fact to which attention should be called, and that is, that the so called Separate schools are in reality a Public school. Such schools use text-books authorized by the Department of Education. They are subject to the same inspection as other schools and they are entitled to the same provincial grants. In fact, at the time of the debate in the House of Commons on the question, it was made very plain that the Separate school when once established was entitled to and must have the same financial supply as the Public school.

In conclusion, I only desire to say that in the rights of the minority, whether Catholic or Protestant, are concerned, they are exactly the same today as they were in 1905. They are, therefore, exactly the same today as they were in Territorial days, and, insofar as the Government of Saskatchewan is concerned, we have no intention of attempting in any way to interfere with such rights. The record of the Government in educational matters is before the people of this province. I know that during the past few years more has been done in Saskatchewan to create an efficient school system than has been done in any Province of Canada, and I do not propose to be drawn aside from my educational work by the discussion of questions which can only result in creating and emphasizing divisions amongst our people. I propose to pursue a policy of endeavoring to unite the people in the interests of education on all matters upon which they can agree and I am content to leave my own record and the policy pursued by the Department of Education in the hands of the people of the Province.

Monsignor Pietro Benedetti, director of the Acta Apostolicae Sedis, the official organ of the Vatican, has been appointed Delegate Apostolic to Mexico.

TRIBUTES TO CHIEF JUSTICE WHITE

ALL EULOGISTS OF EMINENT
CATHOLIC STRESS HIS
ARDENT LOVE OF
AMERICA

(By the N. C. W. C. News Service)

The tributes paid the memory of Chief Justice White by the many notable Americans who have known him and been associated with him in public life indicate the esteem and affection in which this most distinguished Catholic was held. As the late Cardinal Gibbons was the most widely known member of the hierarchy the late Chief Justice was probably the best known of American Catholic laymen.

High government officials, including the President, the heads of the executive departments, leading members of both parties in the Senate and House of Representatives; members of the Supreme Court, and prominent citizens throughout the nation have united in expressions of regret at the death of Chief Justice White and in praise of his ability and character, as exemplified in his conduct of the highest judicial office in the Nation.

PRESIDENT HARDING'S ORDER

President Harding issued an executive order directing that the national flag on the Government buildings be displayed at half-staff and that the White House and the Government Departments be closed on the day of the funeral. Flags on the legations and consulates of the United States in foreign countries will be displayed at half-staff for thirty days following the receipt of the President's order.

Referring to the late Chief Justice, the President's order reads: "In his death the United States has lost one of its most distinguished citizens and public servants, whose legal training and profound knowledge made him eminently fitted for the highest judicial office of the country. He had served well and faithfully as a senator of the United States, as an Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, and as Chief Justice of the United States. His judicial opinions, based always on the principles of right and justice, and unbiassed by personal influences and consideration, will hold high rank among the decisions of the country's highest court of justice."

"His private life was simple and unadorned and characterized by virtues which might well serve as example for the people of America."

TRIBUTES OF HUGHES AND TAFT

A tribute of special significance was paid the memory of the late Chief Justice by Secretary of State, Charles E. Hughes, former Associate Justice of the Court over which Chief Justice White presided. Secretary Hughes said:

"The death of Chief Justice White reminds me of our greatest jurists and he will be remembered as one of the leading figures in the history of the Supreme Court. He brought to the bench a broad experience in which he had touched every side of life. As an Associate Justice he had already won a place in the front rank of our judges because of his mental alertness, his extraordinary acumen and his strong grasp of questions of fundamental importance. He performed the duties of Chief Justice with rare ability; he had not only the intellectual power requisite to leadership, but also the tact and sympathy which are invaluable in the direction of the work of the Court. In his relations with his brethren, with the Bar and with all who came in contact with him he showed an untiring generosity and tenderness and no public man of our time has been more dearly loved by all who knew him."

One of the most impressive tributes came from former President Taft who appointed Justice White to the highest judicial position within the gift of the American Government, notwithstanding differences of political and religious affiliations which rendered the appointment noteworthy at the time it was made. Mr. Taft said:

"Chief Justice White's death will be mourned by the whole country. He was one of our great Chief Justices and has always been so regarded. A judge of the Supreme Court of Louisiana, he was thereafter United States Senator from Louisiana. In his State he fought a good fight against the Louisiana lottery evil and won. He was appointed to the Supreme Court of the United States by President Cleveland and after seventeen years of service was in 1910 made Chief Justice. He had been a lawyer of large practice when he was elected to the Senate and was equally familiar with the civil and the common law."

"As a boy he was a Confederate soldier and was captured at Port Gibson, but no judge ever sat on the Supreme Bench who was more deep than he. He brought to the discharge of his great duties an ever-increasing sense of responsibility to the people of the United States in the preservation of the Constitution and the maintenance of the public interest and private right as therein balanced. He had a great personal life and it enabled him to exercise his influence in the courts. His name is writ large in the constitutional jurisprudence of this nation."

N. Y. TIMES TRIBUTE

Leading papers, throughout the nation gave editorial expression to

the universal regret at the passing of a commanding figure in the nation's life. The New York Times of May 20, says: "It was a marked tribute to the high judicial repute which Mr. White had won when President Taft chose him as Chief Justice. It was a Republican nominating a Democrat, a Union man selecting a Confederate, a Protestant designating a Catholic. All this was speedily forgotten, as no doubt Mr. Taft was confident it would be, in the presence of the public services rendered by the Chief Justice. No litigant before him ever stopped to inquire about parties or sections of the country or religious beliefs. The Chief Justice was of and for the entire nation. His love of justice and his patriotism—visibly quickened as was the latter during the World War—were all embracing, so that it is as one of the first citizens of the Republic that he will be universally mourned."

SENATOR LODGE'S EULOGY

When the news of the death of the Chief Justice was announced Thursday morning, gloom settled over the National Capital. As the word spread among the crowds hurrying to work in the various government departments, through the hotel lobbies, the clubrooms, the banking and business houses of the city, life of conversation could be overheard on all sides, expressive of regret at the passing on of the head of the Nation's Judiciary.

When the Senate met at noon, Senator Cummins, president pro tem, made the announcement of the death of the Chief Justice. The Senate appointed a committee to represent it at the funeral and adjourned after brief eulogies of the dead jurist, by Senators Lodge and Randall. The Republican Senate leader said:

"A loss has befallen the country in the death of the Chief Justice. He filled one of the greatest offices which it is permitted to a man to hold. The late Chief Justice honored this place as much as the office honored him. He was devoted to the law, learned in the law, high-minded, impartial, always fearless in every scene of life and a lover of his country in every fibre of his being."

"His modesty was equal to the greatness of his place and no one who knew him I believe ever spoke of him without some accompanying word of affection. He was a great lawyer, a fine character and always human and sympathetic. We do not forget that he went from this body to the court which he was so long to lead and adorn. It is our privilege to number him among those who have greatly added to the renown of the Senate of the United States."

The Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, as well as the Municipal Court, and the Juvenile Court, adjourned, out of respect to the Chief Justice. The District Court of Appeals is in recess until the first Monday in June.

The House of Representatives did not meet on Thursday but adjourned on Friday after a fifteen minute session during which it directed the appointment of a committee to represent it at the funeral.

THE JURIST'S FRIENDS

Chief Justice White's closest friend in Washington was Justice McKenna, of California, who is also a Catholic. Every Sunday these two distinguished jurists attended Mass at St. Matthew's Church. It was an edifying sight to all the members of the congregation to witness the devotion with which they followed the sacred service.

After Mass they usually took a walk together and during their stroll undoubtedly talked over difficult cases pending before the Court; for it was not an uncommon sight to see them stop and face each other on the sidewalk, speaking with great earnestness and frequently enforcing their argument with gesticulations.

Physically they were opposite types. The Chief Justice was a man of large bulk and heavy countenance, while Justice McKenna is of slight build and remarkably straight figure. For one of his years, Chief Justice White appeared to be the older of the two, owing to his bent form, but Justice McKenna is two years older, being now in his seventy-ninth year, although he would not be taken for more than sixty-five.

Every afternoon on his way home from the Court, rain or shine, Chief Justice White stopped at a flower shop and bought a flower for Mrs. White. Great jurist, he was also the highest type of a chivalrous Southern gentleman.

CONSISTENCY?

"RATHER PROUD" OF TRUTHFUL
STATEMENT A DECADE
AGO; NOW—!

To the Editor of The Globe: In a long speech delivered by Walter Mills, son of the late David Mills, Minister of Justice, at the Anglican Synod of Huron, held at Stratford, June 15, 1911, he said, among other things: "It (the Catholic Church) does not interfere with the civil law, but in the celebration of marriage whatever the civil requirements of the law, the Church always complies with the law while celebrating the marriage as a sacrament."

TEN YEARS AGO

"In the Province of Quebec, according to the Civil Code, there is this provision under section 127. After enumerating in previous sections the various impediments according to law, this section comes in as the only provision in the law of any State of

this continent which shows respect for religious institutions. It reads, 'Other impediments recognized according to the different religious persuasions as results from relationship or affinity or from other causes, remain subject to the rules hitherto followed in the different Churches and religious communities.' It is not applicable to any individual Church. It does not single out the Church of Rome. . . . It says to Methodists, Congregationalists, etc., if there are any impediments which exist according to the rights of your Church the law of this Province respects them, for Christianity is recognized as part of the common law of the land. The law of this Province not only tolerates your faith, but it so far respects it as to require that its conditions shall be observed before the validity of the marriage can be asserted. The Church of Rome has a provision, according to the decrees Tametsi and the decrees Ne Temere, which makes it imperative on all persons baptized in the Roman Catholic Church, in order to celebrate a valid marriage, that they should do so in the presence of the priest of their Church. This was once the law of the Church of England. It was once the law of the Presbyterian Church in Scotland and in the North of Ireland. It was once the law of this Church that where no difficulty existed the presence of a clergyman must be deemed indispensable and the services of a Roman Catholic priest would not be sufficient."

At the end of the Synod the presiding Bishop said: "I am sure that in no public assembly in this country where the subject has been discussed has the Church of Rome found so able a defender. I do not say this in any spirit of deprecation. I am rather proud of it."

TODAY

Knowing all this you can hardly imagine my astonishment, on reading in your issue of May 11, the following words of the presiding Bishop at this year's session of the same Synod:

"We rejoice that marriages legally contracted in this country can no longer be dissolved at the behest of any religious communion. To break up legally constituted families merely on a religious technicality was a monstrous thing, and wholly contrary to the teaching of Christ. To do so in His name was simply defiant impiety and a blasphemous attack on His sacred character."

Comment is surely unnecessary, even if there was sufficient space.

J. MACRAE.

Toronto, Ont.

FATHER FRASER'S CHINA MISSION FUND

There are four hundred million pagans in China. If they were to pass in review at the rate of a thousand a minute, it would take nine months for them all to go by. Thirty-three thousand of them are daily unbaptized! Missionaries are urgently needed to go to their rescue.

China Mission College, Almonte, Ontario, Canada, is for the education of priests for China. It has already twenty-two students, and many more are applying for admittance. Unfortunately funds are lacking to accept them all. China is crying out for missionaries. They are ready to go. Will you send them? The salvation of millions of souls depends on your answer to this urgent appeal. His Holiness the Pope blesses benefactors, and the students pray for them daily.

A Bursar of \$5,000 will support a student in perpetuity. Help to complete the Burses.

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

QUEEN OF APOTHEOSIS BURSAR

Previously acknowledged \$2,017 80
Child of Mary, Toronto..... 1 00

ST. ANTHONY'S BURSAR

Previously acknowledged... \$1,174 70

IMMACULATE CONCEPTION BURSAR

Previously acknowledged... \$2,417 28
G. Lynch, Ottawa..... 10 15

COMPANIES OF THE APOTHEOSIS BURSAR

Previously acknowledged... \$860 80
Friend, Toronto..... 1 00

ST. JOSEPH, PATRON OF CHINA, BURSAR

Previously acknowledged... \$1,948 44
M. C. D..... 1 00

FOR FAVORS RECEIVED, TORONTO..... 1 00

BLESSED SACRAMENT BURSAR

Previously acknowledged... \$818 06
A friend of the Sacred Heart 2 00

ANON, TORONTO..... 1 00

ST. FRANCIS XAVIER BURSAR

Previously acknowledged... \$279 80
Friend of China Mission, Almonte..... 1 00

HOLY NAME OF JESUS BURSAR

Previously acknowledged... \$226 06

HOLY SOULS BURSAR

Previously acknowledged... \$1,012 75
A friend, Douglas..... 1 00

IN MEMORY OF DECEASED PARENTS, ALMONTE..... 1 00

LITTLE FLOWER BURSAR

Previously acknowledged... \$667 84
Mrs. J. Burns, Toronto..... 5 00

SACRED HEART DRAGON BURSAR

Previously acknowledged... \$1,494 57

In omitting this highest aim of