

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 481 and 483 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

Editors: REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES.

Author of "Mistakes of Modern Ideals."

THOMAS COFFEY.

Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.

Managers, Luke King, John Nish, P. J. Naven.

and Joseph S. King, as fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

Agents for Newfoundland, Mr. T. J. Wall St. John's.

John's.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, aeste measurement.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishop of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshawa, N. S., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.

When subscribers change their residence it is important that the old as well as the new address be sent us.

Agents for collectors have no authority to stop your paper unless the amount due is paid.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA.

Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1900.

To the Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

London, Ont.:

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper, THE CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

It is a matter and form both good; and a truly Catholic spirit pervades it.

Therefore, with pleasure, I can recommend it to the faithful.

Blessing you and wishing you success. Believe me to remain,

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ,

D. FALGOUT, Arch. of Halifax, Apost. Deleg.

London, Saturday Feb. 1, 1902

THE PROPOSED ANTI-ANARCHIST LEGISLATION.

The Anarchists of the United States are in a great flutter of indignation against President Roosevelt on account of that part of his message to Congress which recommends legislation for the suppression of anarchy.

The Free Society, an avowed Anarchistic organ published in Chicago, characterizes the message as "a pitiable exhibition of stupidity and ignorance," and the editor adds, speaking in the first person: "Instead of showing the least knowledge or discernment, it is simply a relish of recent newspaper ravings during a time of panic. I had credited Roosevelt with some independence and intelligence; but I must admit that I was a victim of 'dope' and committed the folly of giving credence to some current reports."

Some other journals, which are not professedly anarchistic, but which nevertheless conceal anarchical sentiments behind the mask of Socialism, speak just as strongly against the President's proposal. Thus, another Chicago paper, which professes to speak in the interest of the working classes, says:

"Confiding creatures alone imagine that federal laws against Anarchy would be enforced only against men with knives, torches, pistols, and bombs. It is impossible to draft a law such as President Roosevelt proposes which could not be enforced against labor union speakers and papers by a federal administration in sympathy with employers; against Democratic speakers and papers by a Republican Administration, or against Republican speakers and papers by a Democratic Administration. The dangers of centralization from Mr. Roosevelt's recommendations for the punishment of 'Anarchists,' a recommendation as vague as if it were for the punishment of 'bad men,' are too great to be invoked as lightly and thoughtlessly as the President advises."

The Free Society is the same paper which shortly before President McKinley's assassination published full directions to intending murderers of rulers, how they should proceed in order to accomplish their purpose, and how they should, after successfully doing this, conceal the identity of any accomplices whom they might have.

The very fact that such newspapers are opposed to such legislation as the President advises, is a strong evidence that they fear it will be successful in suppressing the anarchical associations of which they are the chief promoters.

The argument that the President's proposition will be used for the suppression of free speech is but a miserable pretence. How can it be said that this will be the case, before the specific legislation is brought forward?

The anarchists close their eyes to the fact that any legislation on the subject will be carefully considered in both Houses of Congress by able men, and due consideration will be given to any measures proposed. At all events, the sentiment of the American people is unmistakably to the effect that Anarchism must be put down with a strong hand, and no such pretentious reasoning as that used by the Anarchistic press will divert the country from its fixed determination to suppress Anarchism once for all, and if it be determined that Anarchists should be deported, Congress is in a mood to decide that deported they shall be; and should this step be taken, the country will be all the better off for their leaving it unceremoniously.

Let the slang of the avowed Anarchistic writer above quoted may not be fully understood by our readers, it may be advisable to explain here that "dope" is a name given to prepared opium by frequenters of Chinese opinion-dens in the large cities of the United States.

Herr Isak, the editor of the Free Society, considers, or professes to consider the proposition of President Roosevelt to be the ravings of an idiot; but the common sense of the nation is entirely with the President in this matter, and the Anarchists are much mistaken if they imagine that they alone possess good sense. It will be found out also that whatever law may be passed by Congress dealing with Anarchy and the Anarchists will not trench upon the reasonable liberties of the press and people, even though the result may be the suppression of such literature as the Free Society furnishes to its readers.

The people of the United States may be congratulated on the fact that at this critical moment they have for President a man who is known to have the courage to meet the anarchistic trouble without flinching from his duty. The chief of the rough riders of San Juan will not allow himself and the nation to be rough-riden by such desperate characters in talk at least as Herr Isak and Emma Goldman.

A. P. A. DREAMS OF PLOTS.

The Apapists of the United States, or those whose bigotry survives the collapse of that practically defunct society, are busy discovering Polish plots in recent events in the United States—but the discoveries made are certainly not characterized by consistency with each other or with common sense.

The American Citizen, one of the few A. P. A. journals which have been able to eke out an existence, published this month two letters from correspondents on the trial of Admiral Schley, one of which asserts very positively that the Admiral was guilty of treason in not destroying more effectually the Spanish fleet. According to this idiot, Schley, being "a tool of Rome, was acting under instructions from Rome to spare the Spanish fleet and save Rome from disaster."

This writer continues: "He (Schley) was not a coward—nobody accuses him of cowardice—he simply obeyed orders of the Church. As is well-known, his family connections are papal. Dewey's defense of Schley is a part of the same papal policy. Mrs. Dewey professes to be an Episcopalian now, but she is still under papal influences, and the Admiral is under her influence as he was in the matter of giving away his residence. Hence his attitude."

The other correspondent demands of the Citizen why it "does not expose the Papal conspiracy against brave Schley. You know how Rome hates and persecutes apostates, and you must know that Admiral Schley is regarded as an Apostate; for did not his family leave the Church of Rome?"

This writer continues: "His niece, Jessie Schley, as you will remember, a few years ago wrote letters to the New York dailies, praising convent training and attacking the A. P. A. She remains—as does her family—in popery, while the Admiral and his family left the papal fold. Is not this sufficient to account for the attacks upon him?"

This is too much even for the Apapist editor of the Citizen, who says: "If our correspondent can assure us on good authority that Admiral Schley's family were ever Romanists, we will look more favorably upon this side of the question."

The editor would evidently be very glad if he could materialize this Popish conspiracy into a real plot, but, in despair of so doing, he throws up his hands in acknowledgment of his utter incompetency to do this.

WILL THE CROWN OR JOHN KENSIT PREVAIL.

The Kensitites have once more exhibited themselves as disturbers of the Church of England services against which they protest. They assembled in great force with their doughty leader John Kensit on Jan 22 to protest against the confirmation of the Rev. Charles Gore, Canon of Westminster, as Bishop of Worcester.

Canon Gore was formerly Chaplain-in-Ordinary to Queen Victoria; but he is a high Churchman, and the Kensitites are therefore strongly opposed to him. One persistent objector to the services who refused to hold his tongue in the Cathedral was forcibly ejected, but notwithstanding the row, and cries of "Farce!" "Lies!" by the Kensitites, the decree of Confirmation was read, the Vicar-General refusing to hear the counsel of the Kensitites who was ready to maintain their objections.

The Kensitites have appealed their case to the court of Queen's Bench, which has rendered a decision that their objections must be heard. This they regard as a great victory, as the decision was scarcely expected. The Archbishop has decided to await the final decision of the Court on the objections, before proceeding with the Confirmation of the new Bishop. It is fully expected, however, that the Bishop-elect's confirmation and consecration will be proceeded with, as there can be no serious objection raised against the paramount authority of the Crown in the selection of a Bishop. If, however, the

selection of the Crown can be set aside, the event will mark a new era in the existence of the Church of England; and in any event it is a curious sight to see the Kensitites, who boast of their supereminent loyalty, ranging themselves against the King on the question of the selection of a Bishop.

CHURCH MUSIC.

We are quite in accord with Professor Stockley's sentiment expressed in the following letter, that the rules laid down by the Church for the direction of priests and choirs in regard to church music should be strictly adhered to. The aim of the Church in making these rules is to ensure that only such music or chant as is suitable to the house of God should be rendered therein, and that whatever is indecorous should be excluded from being sung during the divine worship.

We are quite aware that sometimes choirs make mistakes by singing during Mass or Vespers what ought not to be heard in the church at all; but we can scarcely conceive that any soloist should have been so perverse, or so entirely oblivious of the respect due to the house of God, and to God Himself, as to introduce a hyperbolic love song during the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, whereas adoration should be given at all times to Almighty God alone. However, we may accept Mr. Stockley's word that such a thing really happened; and we thoroughly agree with him that it was an outrage which is scarcely pardonable even on the plea of invincible ignorance and temporary forgetfulness of what is due to God and to the Church of God on the part of the perpetrator.

The other songs mentioned by our respected correspondent in a similar connection, though not so grossly culpable as in the instance just referred to, are also to be condemned as unbecoming.

We do not precisely understand our correspondent's allusions to the CATHOLIC RECORD as if we had treated pastors, organists and choirs unfairly in some references made by us in the matter of Church music. While we have always maintained the obligation of obeying the laws of the Church in regard to music, we have from time to time reminded correspondents on this subject that these laws are not of the cast iron character which positively excludes all music outside of the Gregorian chant, where circumstances make it impossible or extremely difficult to conform entirely to the Gregorian standard.

Even though there may be from time to time mistakes made in some churches, by the occasional introduction of inappropriate music, we believe, after all, that the local authorities of the Church, the Bishops and priests, are usually competent to decide how far they can conform to the desirable standard, in the special circumstances in which they may be placed.

To the Editor of the CATHOLIC RECORD: Sir,—Is the CATHOLIC RECORD quite fair to (a) pastors, (b) organists and (c) choirs?

Because, it is not the priests who are responsible for Mascagni's Opera-Intermezzo sung as an Ave Maria, nor even for Haydn's charming quarter of an hour of Amen's.

The great difficulty about our Church music is that the clergy do not guide, do not instruct. I mean, not only in matters of taste, but in simple matters of definite rules of Holy Church. The choirs are in material heresy only, through invincible ignorance. And that brings us to the second question. Are you just to the choirs? Because, the Church does not ask them to turn from their opera scraps and bravura arias to Gregorian chant only. We need not be more Catholic than Rome.

We have definite rules from Rome in these respects that follow below. There need be no fuss, no quarrelling, no re-education; but simply a "taking of Rome at her word"—so an English priest puts it—by priests and people. We pride ourselves on our loyalty to Rome. But who is the loyal servant? He who hears His Lord's word and doeth it. Nothing hard is asked. Every Catholic choir could obey its priest to-morrow, if he were to enforce these simple Roman rules:

(1) No drawing room airs, such as we hear in Canada—neither Sullivan's "Lost Chord" nor Mendelssohn's "Forest," part song, nor "Home Sweet Home."

(2) No national airs. And so no addressing, at Mass, of a lady with "Thou wouldst still be adored as this moment thou art, let thy loveliness fade as it will." No playing a priest off the altar with "The Minstrel Boy to the war is gone," followed by an echo of "Come Back to Erin," when the priest had reached the altar. "I gave the Canadian organist a piece of my mind," said the Irish priest, to whom that happened; "it won't happen to me again."

(3) No operas: neither Wagner's Pilgrim's chorus, nor Weber's "Prayer," none of them, from Rossini to Mascagni.

(4) No repetitions by the choir of the words "Gloria in Excelsis Deo" and "Credo in Unum Deum"; as if their singing was not part of the chant begun by the priest at the altar.

(5) No changing of the slightest word in the text. Therefore no Rosewig's "Misericordias Nobis" (twice) and "Domine Nihil Pacem" (5 times), "Agnus Dei" being omitted; and no Wiegand's

"Agnus Dei, Dominus Deus, Filius Patris." They are forbidden; just as is unigenitum non factum; factum non genitum, which a Canadian Jesuit Father says he heard, and which no doubt our unfortunate choirs free from all clerical control would willingly sing.

(6) The Proper of the Mass should be sung; or at least recited in monotone.

(7) The proper psalms, hymns and antiphons of Vespers are not to be omitted.

Having obeyed the letter of the law, we shall be more in the mind of dutiful children who will seek rather to anticipate than to frustrate their mother's wishes, and to solo displaying for instance, and vain repetitions, and reproducing in church of the parlor sentimentality of the half educated.

But do not blame the pastors, unless for what they do not.

And do not suggest that singing in obedience to the Church's rule, and with a decent artistic spirit of fitness, and with common sense of the distinctions due to time and place, must necessarily mean singing only the authorized music of the Church, the Gregorian Chant.

It guides we need. The clergy should be our guides; in loyal service to Rome.

Yours truly,

W. F. P. STOCKLEY.

Fredericton, N. B., January, 1902.

SELF-SACRIFICING SISTERS.

The authorities of Trenton, N. J., have accepted the offer of the Franciscan Sisters of the Franciscan Hospital of that city to attend the small-pox patients; who are numerous, as disease has been prevalent there for some months.

The Sisters certainly did not make the offer to attend on these patients with any intention of obtaining an earthly reward; nevertheless the authorities should undoubtedly offer a proper recompense to the ladies who have undertaken this dangerous duty, the more especially as they were unable to obtain other nurses to wait upon those infected by the contagion.

A year ago, the same Sisters performed a similar office by attending the small-pox patients, and they were not offered any recompense, except that the city council paid for the Sisters' clothing which had to be destroyed after they left the bedsides of their patients. After such dishonorable and parsimonious treatment, the action of the Sisters in offering again to take care of the patients is a most heroic act of self-sacrifice which deserves special commendation.

The Angelus.

The accompanying incident is taken from the Philadelphia North American: It was just 6 o'clock. The bell in the tower of St. John the Evangelist, in South Thirteenth street, was pealing out the Angelus.

Its sounds floated above the noise and hum of Chestnut street, but now and then in a moment of calm penetrated softly to the street. To the crowd it had no significance, but to one at least it meant more than the simple pealing of an evening bell. He was only a street cleaner, and Italian, and when the notes of the bell, muffled in the roar of the city, met his ears he removed his soiled white cap, and leaning forward on his broom, crossed himself devoutly and bowed his head to the simple words of the prayer.

In the middle of the street, thousands passing on either side, he was far from the city's throng, away in the sunny fields and vineyards of Italy.

In pose and reverent attitude he was the living embodiment of Millet's famous "L'Angelus." There was even a touch of the indescribable loneliness of the picture in the figure of the man. Despite the crowd of the noise and the eternal roar of the city, he conveyed an impression of aloneness as of a man apart from the world. The moment of prayer lifted him out of his lowly garb and above his mean surroundings, and in the figure of this humble Italian was a spirit of simple dignity and reverence that would lend power to a painter's brush.

Sabbath and Sunday.

From the Interurban Catholic.

When was the Sabbath changed to Sunday?

The Sabbath was changed to Sunday on the morning of the Resurrection. The Jewish Christians, following the example of our Lord, kept holy the ancient or legal Sabbath; but soon afterwards adopted the first day of the week, or Sunday, to be kept holy. This we infer from the Acts of the Apostles xx, 7: "And on the first day of the week, when we were assembled to break bread, Paul discoursed with them, being to depart on the morrow; and he continued his speech until midnight."

In his epistle to the Corinthians xvi, 2, St. Paul speaks of the first day of the week, or Sunday, to be kept holy. This we infer from the Acts of the Apostles xx, 7: "And on the first day of the week, when we were assembled to break bread, Paul discoursed with them, being to depart on the morrow; and he continued his speech until midnight."

Duke of Norfolk to Marry.

The premier Catholic of England, the Duke of Norfolk, will soon marry Lady Alice Fitzwilliam, who recently became a Catholic.

Lady Alice Mary Fitzwilliam is a daughter of Earl Fitzwilliam. She was born in 1849. The Duke of Norfolk was born in 1847. He married, in 1877, Lady Flora Abney-Hastings, who died in 1887. He has one son living, the Earl of Arundel and Surrey, who was born in 1879.

Would we love God? In Jesus Christ we find His infinite perfections. Would we love humanity? Jesus Christ has His inexpressible purity.—St. Catherine of Siena.

CHURCH, NOVEL AND PLAY-HOUSE.

Someone has written for the Transcript an article (published Jan. 4) which pretends to be a study of a certain type of young girl in South Boston. The writer seems to have acquired an acquaintance with some phases of life among working people, but that this is a surface knowledge only is proved by placing together two passages from the sketch.

He calls his supposed-to-be typical young woman Rosie O'Grady, taking the name from a popular song. In one place he says of her:

"She retains, in nine cases of ten, that confidence, pride and self-respect which make it possible for her to look you squarely in the eyes, fearlessly and on an unquestionable equality. You can safely call her a good girl and a good Catholic."

A little later he speaks of her theatre-going and her novel-reading and says:

"But in the novel, as in the melodrama, virtue invariably gets a marvelous reward and vice is untrifling in paying the devil. . . . In fact, the cheap novel and the thirty-cent drama seem to do much more good than harm—for they furnish a higher code and a deeper inspiration to Rosie O'Grady's mind than she would be likely to find in any other way."

When a writer is so clever as this one, so bent upon being "sympathetic" and so industrious in trying to study his subject "from the inside," it seems too bad to laugh at him. And yet when one observes his complete ignorance of the great fundamental fact in the lives of the people whom he attempts to describe it is impossible not to be amused, and greatly amused. What would he say of a study of present-day conditions in Ireland which made no account of the existence, past or present, of such a place or a people as England and the English? How accurate and exhaustive would be a picture of our own country in which no allusion was made to its being a republic?

Yet neither of these would be half as absurd as a "study" of Rosie O'Grady and her surroundings which contents itself with the bare statement that she is a "good Catholic," and then declares that she gets her highest moral code and her deepest moral inspiration from the thirty-cent theatre and the "shilling shocker" novel.

Has he ever been to a Catholic church? Has he ever heard of the Commandments of God and of the Church as a code of morals, taught in childhood from the catechism and preached every Sunday from the altar? Has he ever heard of the confessional, and in his scientific and "sympathetic" sociological studies, has he ever encountered a statement of the well known fact of the tremendous influence of that divine institution as a safeguard of the innocence and self-respect which so establish him in the young girls whom he tries to paint? It is plain that the careless, all-prevailing, powerful workings of the great Church which holds in its grasp, so firm and so tender, the faithful people, young and old, of his "study," are unknown to him. Lacking this knowledge, his clever and well-meant sketch is superficial and valueless. For the question must be asked: Does he know what he is talking about? And the answer must be, No!—Sacred Heart Review.

Mother Drexel's Gift.

In a pastoral letter Bishop Horstmann of Cleveland, O., mentions the fact that Mother Katherine Drexel, Superior of the Sisters of the Blessed Sacrament, gives \$70,000 annually to the education of the Indian children.

A society was formed in that city last week, the members of which agree to give 25 cents each annually for the "preservation of the faith among the Indians." The movement will be extended throughout the country.

THE CHURCH HAS A RIGHT TO BE SUPPORTED.

Every pastor hears again and again expressions of generous good will such as these: "I will give something to the Church as soon as I get out of debt;" "if fortune favors me I shall not forget the needs of religion;" or "when I succeed I gave freely;" or "when I succeed in paying my bills I will attend to the pew-rent question." Underlying all these statements is the false assumption that the Church has strictly no financial claims upon her children; that the most she can do is to make appeals; that her title to support rests upon charity and not upon justice. Assuredly the Church is not disposed to urge her demands by force, no more than to enforce obedience to the Ten Commandments by the aid of the sword; but she gives no semblance of assent to the heresy that her material support is to be derived from the occasional offerings of a whimsical generosity.

Financial support of religion is implied in the first and greatest commandment. God is to be adored by sacrificial worship as well as by faith and prayer. The discharge of this fundamental duty naturally involves everything essential to the appropriate expression of becoming sacrifice. This Divine injunction, therefore, carries with it the imperative necessity of supplying suitable places of worship and of maintaining a divinely appointed priesthood. To keep holy God's day and name, to respect the rights of parents and others, are Divine commands. There is no less sanction for providing the material agencies necessary for carrying out the true intent of God's first law. There is here no question of charity or generosity, but of duty and justice. In issuing a special precept on the support of pastors (meaning everything pertaining to external worship) the Church merely emphasizes a Commandment as old as religion itself.

To put the claims of religion last of all, to offer God crumbs from sumptuously supplied tables, to proffer Him a percentage in the possibilities of fortune, is basely to insult the Deity. God does not ask for what man does not need, and He directs the unfolding of

the future. He is pleased with the gifts that denote sacrifice—the poor man's penny, the widow's mite. They who promise to give of their abundance exhibit a wrong spirit. It is well to remember that the claims of the Church are as positive and as pressing as other obligations; that these claims are to be paid not merely from the ample means of the rich, but also from the slender incomes of the struggling. God should not always be the deferred Creditor—in fact, He ought to be the preferred Creditor. The support of the Church is a duty of simple justice. Religion would go forward with leaps and bounds if pew-rents and Church dues were paid from a sense of homely honesty. The Church is suffering from too much "charity."—Baltimore Mirror.

To Please God.

All sorts of good actions and all sorts of noble effort are of little use unless the motive power is right. Away below all expression and struggle lies the motive, the purpose, which is the thing that God judges us by, and which really makes the year and the man who lives through the year happy or unhappy. . . . Back of all action and happiness must lie the thought of God. He made us to be happy, because He loves us. He wishes us to be successful because our lives have a meaning which He planned. The motive for right living must be to please Him, to reach the place He has fitted for us to occupy, to serve the grand purpose He had when He created us.—Rev. F. W. Tomkins.

WHAT'S IN A NAME?

A writer signing himself Edwin D. Weed, of Brooklyn, N. Y., in a letter to the New York Times, and endorsed by the Living Church of Dec. 11, undertakes to answer a criticism of Bishop Burke of Albany on the proposed change of name by the Protestant Episcopal Church. The new name proposed was "the American Catholic Church in the United States." Mr. Weed declares that this is not really adopting a new name, but we believe that all the rest of the world will think it a decided and very extreme change. In fact, one might be puzzled to find a greater change than that from "Protestant Episcopal" to "American Catholic."

Mr. Weed again says: "The Bishop (Burke) agrees with the American Catholic Church in stating that 'there is but one Catholic Church.' But the head of the Catholic Church is not the Pope of Rome, but Our Lord Jesus Christ." That is just what the Presbyterians and all other Protestant sects maintain. Why is not their claim just as good as his? The assertion is a very bold and decided one, as if there could be no doubt or dispute about it. But, unfortunately, this is the very question at issue. Of course, Mr. Weed acknowledges that the Catholic Church is an organized body. But every organized body must have a head. If the Catholic Church is an organized body—and there can be no reasonable doubt of it—it must have a head—not an invisible, but a visible head.

Of course true Catholics acknowledge the invisible headship of Our Lord Jesus Christ, but they insist that as the Catholic Church in the world is a visible body, so it must necessarily have a visible head and centre of unity of the whole body. It is impossible to belong to that Church without being in communion with that visible head.

The idea of branches of the true Catholic Church not in communion with the head is simply absurd and impossible. Unity is an essential note of the true Church. Our Lord foresaw that and provided an infallible head in the apostle Peter, whose very name indicated the nature of the office which he was chosen to fulfill. "Thou art Peter—a rock—and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." To him He gave the power of the keys—the symbol of supreme authority; him He commissioned to feed the sheep and lambs of His flock, and for him He prayed that his faith should not fail, and when he was converted he was to confirm his brethren. This is just the office that our Holy Father the Pope—successor of St. Peter in the See of Rome—discharges to-day. As supreme judge and final court of appeal in all questions of faith and morals, the prayer of Our Lord guarantees him against the liability of failure. And this is just what the Church needs and without which it is impossible for the Church to fulfill the great mission for which it was established in the world. Without such a head, unity of faith or organization is absolutely impossible. So long as this is lacking in the Episcopal Church, so long will it be Protestant, and any attempt, by change of name or otherwise, to make the unwary believe that it is Catholic will be misleading and in effect dishonest.—Sacred Heart Review.

To Let God Lead.

If we were strong and faithful enough to trust ourselves entirely to God, and to follow Him simply where ever He wished to lead us, we should have no need of great application of mind to labor in the work of perfection; but because we are so weak in faith, that we wish to know where we are going, without trusting to God—it is this that makes our way much longer and spoils our spiritual affairs. Abandon yourself as much as you can to God, until your last breath, and He will never forsake you.—Fenelon.

Marks of the Lord.

Better, far better, to wear now "in the body the marks of the Lord Jesus," than we may be arrayed at the last day in the white raiment, than to be full of the gifts of this life, to be served and worshipped by the world, and at that day to stand before His piercing eye naked and defiled, and all men see our shame.—Cardinal Manning.

Humble yourself always, and be lowly and of no repute in your own eyes and in those of others, that you may become great in the eyes of God.

A NEW BIBLE.

The publication in version of the Bible century parlance has been the sole rule. Their objection to it that its modern family subjects recorded in it. There is doubtless the objection, but it force when coming heretofore been such of translations of the vulgar tongue or fair people.

The objection is first translation of the last. The King's Protestant standard was at that time the phraseology or dict of present peoples dignified did not seem so to time. It was to the familiar parlance is common to the average of the language of the King J. to us of the present. The able and school-vocate (Methodist) protest against the what may seem strange:

"The Bible is in the language of and to be so precise God. It is a unique purpose and spirit unique in diction. It is to be revered and it is to be revered ever-changing language for many it must be slung, which is another the language of the King J. to us of the present. The able and school-vocate (Methodist) protest against the what may seem strange:

Here the Advocate of Catholics in the tion who condemn of the word of G. irreverent translation responsible and in Catholic objectors, since rather to it heretical errors of languages into vulgar translated. The principle; the latter all it sounds strange of the Advocate, book to put into common people, as the word of G. should be interpreted of the people understand it." private judgment Freeman's Journal.

Manly C.

J. K. Huysmans author, has the Catholics of Holland. "The Catholics minority, which d the fact that they serried ranks, form of grave Christ who does not live to be nothing lectured for one's fact to one; for if it has decimated the also wonderfully that have resisted such as I have seen effeminate about Catholicism."

CATHOLIC.

A Lovely Land true and

Spain is one of countries in the especially the little in manners the course of ce Weekly. They same now as the the Moors, or at Kabbala. The different point people. With tured, it cost Spain and Span it is subject for animadversion ing to listen forth by tourists

Those who live industrial country they call civilities for money Spain's unprogressed the whole utility; beauty These devote calls "a sordidism," would chimney's black smoke to able blue of shapeliness heaps now the rushing flowery banks of luxuriant about the "in who are so "be actually preferable, lived a ideals, to tolling till tight bars—for others ably—is amusing

Yet another regard Spain the "bloody monks and friars people given oration, who consists, as an conty of "M ship."

On the other and culture, lover of all th in art an of inexhausti loveliness. I