

Omniscient Spirit in such a manner that every statement contained in them was, when properly understood, absolutely free from error, and contained no message fraught with supernatural authority. In place of this belief science has forced on us the recognition that, whatever truths the Biblical books may contain, these truths are embedded in a mass of error—legends pretending to be history, in reminiscences pretending to be prophecies, and in the frequent inculcation of conduct not only immoral but monstrous. It has forced on us a recognition, also, of something still more revolutionary—something which concerns not the errors of the Bible, but its truths. It has forced us to recognize that the truths recorded in its pages are to be accepted by us, if they are historical, only on such grounds as would secure our acceptance of them if stated by any ordinary historian; and are to be accepted by us, if they are moral and spiritual, only insofar as they prompt us to endorse them as morally and spiritually satisfactory.

HIGHER CRITICISM AND THE BIBLE.—The change thus briefly indicated is a reality of the most momentous kind and is no mere invention or imagination of anti-Christian critics, can be shown by reference to the writings of the apologetes and apologists themselves, and apologetes belonging to the most diverse and antagonistic schools. I will confine myself to the evidence of Protestants whom the change affects most decidedly, and whose natural impulse would be to minimize it as far as possible; and for examples of such evidence I will go to three writers who represent Protestantism of three widely different kinds. One of them is English, another is German, and the third is American. The first is the editor of *Lux Magna*, a volume of High Church apologetics, to which he himself has contributed an essay on Biblical inspiration. The second is the Dean of Canterbury. The third is Professor Harnack.

CANON GORE.—Canon Gore, as might naturally be expected, maintains that, in spite of science, the supernatural inspiration of the Bible is as defensible now as ever, but it is impossible to admit a stronger language than that which science has so resolutely insisted on. He says: "The Bible is, as to force as to defend its inspiration on practically new grounds. His entire essay on 'The Holy Spirit and Inspiration' is an elaboration of this thesis. It partly consists of hints as to what the new grounds will be; but its plan and more emphatic passages are devoted to an acknowledgment of what makes a how real is the change. In doing this he justifies himself with the authority of the Bishop of Oxford. The Bishop, Canon Gore tells us, has said in a recent charge that 'the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament are now going through a process of analytical criticism which has, as we believe, no parallel for acuteness of investigation, carelessness of method, and completeness of apparatus since the days in which they began to be regarded as a code of inspired literature, and certainly not since the days of our Blessed Lord's life on earth'; and this investigation, Canon Gore broadly declares, is effecting a change in our conception of what the Bible is, which, if not greater, is certainly not less, than 'the changes wrought in the acceptance of heliocentric astronomy.'"

PROFESSOR HARNACK.—Professor Harnack uses language which is almost precisely similar. "The most decisive step of all (in religious thought) was taken," he says; "when it was agreed that the understanding and exposition of the Old and New Testaments were neither to be regulated by any 'creed,' nor by allowed out of regard to the sacredness of text, to make use of the other methods than those universally recognized in the application of philology and history. The application of this rule to theology has produced a revolution which still vibrates through the whole of its domain. . . . How has this come about? No one has done it. It is everyone who has done it. It is the sequence of the historical sense, the rise of which indicates a revolution in the history of mankind, no less great than has been produced by the discovery of natural science. The conception of what knowledge means has altered." The only difference between the English High Churchman and the German critic is that the former, with a curious and utterly illegitimate timidity, confines his ravages to an admission of the Old Testament, and shrinks from applying them to the New; whereas the latter knows and admits that their application extends to both; and with regard to the latter, though he considers himself a critical conservative, his conclusions are, as we shall see presently, even more destructive practically than they are with regard to the former.

DEAN FARRAR.—And now let us turn to the witness borne by the Dean of Canterbury. In an article which I published last December in this review, I called attention to Dean Farrar's work 'The Bible: Its Meaning and Its Supremacy.' In certain of his conclusions he differs from Professor Harnack; but his premises are absolutely the same. The cardinal point he insists upon throughout his entire volume is that the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation, is a mixture of truth and error; that the view so prevalent formerly, according to which it was a book demanding in all its facts our credence, or even our respect would, if not abandoned by Christians, reduce their religion to an absurdity; and that the foremost duty of the modern Christian Apologist is to show the skeptic and the infidel that Christians are concerned to defend, not the book as a whole, but select passages only. These, according to the Dean, are in-

deed supernaturally inspired, but all the rest—and the rest is a large proportion of it—we may abandon, as unconcernedly as we might abandon the books of Livy, to the secular critic, who may destroy or spare it as he pleases.

Here, then, we have the admission of three distinguished theologians, who may be taken as representing the whole drift of opinion among the Protestant or reformed churches; and from these admissions there follows one great conclusion which is not only obviously implied in them, but is also enunciated by these writers themselves. That conclusion is this, that the Bible, taken by itself, is no guide to true Christianity, and affords no proof that such and such doctrines are true. It is a guide and a proof only when some authority outside the book is able to earmark what is true and essential in it, and distinguish this from what is indifferent and fallacious. We will return to this point presently, but there is another matter which we must consider first.

We have glanced at the results of criticism on the character and authority of the Bible. It remains for us to see how it has affected our conception of Christian doctrine.

HIGHER CRITICISM AND CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

The result in the latter case is analogous to that in the former. Just as it has destroyed the idea of a self-sufficient and historical Bible, so does it destroy the idea, equally cherished by Protestants, of a self-sufficient, an infallible, a complete primitive Christianity. It has, of course, been always known that two of the Creeds at all events were not composed till long after the Apostolic Age. It has also been known that in the Apostolic Age itself orthodoxy had to combat various forms of heresy, but historical criticism is now elucidating a new truth—namely, that the content of orthodoxy was only very gradually arrived at by the orthodox; and that the nature and mission of Christ, as understood by his immediate followers, was something widely different from the conception of them which pervades Catholicism, and any of the Christian bodies that broke away from Rome. The historical way of regarding the New Testament, may not (says Professor Harnack) and will not, overlook the concrete features, in which and by which the life and the doctrine of Christ were actually fashioned in their day. It seeks for points of connection with the Old Testament and its developments, with the religious life of the Synagogue, with contemporary hopes of the future, with the whole intellectual and spiritual condition of the world of Greece and Rome; and it finds that the evidence of such connection is unmistakable. The consequence is that the sayings and discourses of the Lord, and the image of His life itself, not only take their color—and it is a very definite color—from the history of the time, but they are also seen to possess certain definite limitations. They belong to their time and environment, and they could not exist in any other. And if this is true of the life of Christ Himself and the doctrines recorded by the Evangelists, which He enunciated with His own lips, it is still more emphatically true of the earliest comments on them, and the earliest deductions from them, which we find in the apostolic epistles. So far are apologetes like Canon Gore and the Bishop of Oxford from being right in fancying that criticism is affecting the Old Testament only, that the New, though in a different way, is suffering an even greater change.

REV. S. BARRING GOULD.—For an indication of what this change is let us go to a treatise on St. Paul, by another Anglican writer. This writer is the Rev. S. Baring Gould, who, whatever we may think of his original views put forward by him, does nothing more in his methods and general principles, than follow and illustrate those of the new historical criticism. The profound change that has been thus introduced into our whole conception of the origin of the Christian doctrine is summed up in the following few words, in which the Epistle to the Romans is contrasted by him with the Epistle to the Galatians. "Since Paul," says Mr. Baring Gould, "had written his Epistle to the Galatians, he had reconsidered the arguments he had used in it; some he strengthened, some he laid aside. In the Epistle to the Romans we have his matured thought." That is to say, the greatest of the early English thinkers, who claimed to have been converted by a special revelation of Christ—even he is represented as a man who won his way to the truth very slowly and not without many errors; his writings, which are accepted as part of the sacred Canon, embody his errors and his blunders; and no less than his truths, and even his matured thought was not final or satisfactory. Even in the Epistle to the Romans, Mr. Baring Gould says, "the Apostle was unable to think clearly, and consequently could not express what he felt in intelligible form." Instead of having revealed to us once and forever, an infallible theological system, he, never having received philosophic education, "had done nothing more when he died than make an attempt to formulate one."

"He saw certain possibilities, he perceived mysteries, behind the facts of Christ's life, and these he suggested; but he had not the discipline of mind, acquired by education other than that of rabbinic schools, to think out a complete system of theology." But, as Mr. Baring Gould goes on to observe, in a passage which is the most impressive in his whole book, Paul as his thought matured, and experience taught its lessons to him, had grown to see that a system of theology was needed, and that a doctrine of revelation which could give no intellectual account of itself never could hold its own. "The Primitive Church," Mr. Baring Gould proceeds, "is sometimes extolled for being undogmatic. It was only so because the members were in daily anticipation of the second advent. But already while Christ walked the earth, the question was asked, 'Who art thou?'"

The facts enunciated by the Apostles were living truths. . . . each containing a mystery enfolded but not developed within it. In the gospel of St. Mark, and probably in the first edition in Hebrew of St. Matthew there was no record of the birth of Jesus Christ. In the first years of the Church all that believers asked was 'How are we to prepare for this second coming? But when the Messianic perspective became distant, then men began to ask, 'Who is Christ? Is He a prophet, or is He divine? Is He the Word incarnate, or an emanation from the Father?' It was the function of the Church to answer these questions."

GENERAL CONCLUSION: NECESSITY OF SOME LIVING, EXTERNAL AUTHORITY.

Presumably: it was the Church which built up Christianity as we know it now, and gave us the doctrine for which Protestants, as well as Catholics, have suffered martyrdom. That is to say, these doctrines, in the forms in which we have all received them, have been given us, and impressed on our acceptance, not by the Bible itself—but by the Old Testament or the New, by the recorded words of Christ, or the authorities of His immediate followers—but by some authority external to all these records, these records, these canonical and inspired reasoners, and not only external but also posterior to them. This is the truth which Protestantism came into existence to deny; and this is the truth which, under the compulsion of secular criticism, and the scientific study of history, Protestants of all schools are now unanimously reaffirming. Professor Harnack, the Evangelical, bears witness to it in his history of Christian dogmas. Canon Gore, the Sacramentalist, repeats the conclusion of the Evangelical. "It is impossible to say," he tells us, "what we should make of the New Testament record, what estimate we should be able to form of the person of Jesus Christ, and the meaning of His life and work, if it was contained simply in some old manuscript, or in some old tradition, or in antiquaries' out of the Syrian sand."

THE CRUCIAL QUESTION: WHERE IS THIS AUTHORITY?

Here then, we have focalized and summed up the effect of scientific knowledge on all Protestant forms of Christianity. The original Protestant position set forth by divines like Hooker who denounced as one of the fundamental errors of Rome, the tradition, is, by the Protestantism of to-day, being itself denounced and repudiated; and a doctrine which in some respects at all events resembles that of Rome is more or less explicitly being set up by them in its place. This is the doctrine as a guide to truth, or as a proof of it, Scripture is altogether insufficient. It is guaranteed and interpreted by some authority external to itself; and this authority has to answer two sets of questions: Firstly, since the Bible is a mixture of truth and error, it has to separate for us the inspired passages from the erroneous; and secondly, since the inspired passages imply more than they say, since the Christian Creeds are deduced from, rather than contained in, them, and since equally earnest men have deduced from them very different conclusions, this authority must separate for us what is orthodox in dogma from what is heretical, just as it separates for us in the Bible the divine elements from the human. It is this authority, then, which, for the modern Protestant, is now contained in the Church of Rome, the Catholic, the intellectual and logical foundation on which Christianity rests; and for the Christian world of to-day the supreme problem is: Of what does this authority consist, and how are we to identify its utterances?

One Church, that of Rome, gives a clear and definite answer. The authority in question is the Church of Rome itself, which from time to time, under special conditions, and as the occasion happens to demand, infallibly enunciates the truth through its elaborately organized Councils. We will come to Rome presently; but we must first consider the position of Protestantism, of those churches and parties which, whatever their other differences, are united in being opposed to Rome. Among Protestants, broadly speaking, we find two views current which are not, however, practically so antagonistic as they seem. One is expressed formally in certain articles of the Church of England, which deny the Church of Rome the authority of Councils whatsoever. The other is a view held, in direct defiance of the Articles, by High Church or Sacramental Anglicans, according to which Councils constituted an infallible authority, as Rome maintains they still do, up to the time of the schism between the East and West, when Councils that were truly infallible ceased to be possible any longer, and when consequently the oracles of the Holy Spirit became dumb, and have remained dumb ever since.

NEITHER VIEW SATISFACTORY TO REASON.

The Dean of Canterbury may be taken as representing the former opinion—the opinion that Councils were never infallible. The English Church Union and its leaders may be taken as representing the latter—that Councils were infallible Councils once. Now, though these two parties differ as to the earlier Christian centuries, they differ definitely as to these centuries only. With regard to the whole medieval and modern life of the Church they agree. They agree that if the Church has any teaching authority now, this authority does not speak in the manner in which Rome claims it does. If it ever spoke infallibly through (Ecumenical Councils at all, it has at all events found for itself some new mode of utterance. The question, then, for the Protestant apologist of to-day is: By what means does this authority speak now? And to this question, it is daily growing more apparent, Protestantism can give no reasonable answer.

FARRAR'S THEORY OF 'CHRISTIAN CONSCIOUSNESS' INADEQUATE.—To demonstrate fully that such is the

case, is beyond the scope of the present article. It will be enough here to indicate a few of the facts and arguments on which such a demonstration would be based. Let us begin, then, by briefly considering what the answers are which Protestants of various schools are now actually offering us. Most of these have been collected by the Dean of Canterbury, and he urges them in his book on the Bible, all with equal emotion, never pausing to ask if they are not inconsistent with one another. Thus to the question of what is the authority that shall teach us to separate in the Bible the inspired and infallible portions from those that are erroneous and uninspired, he replies in one place that the required authority is to be found "in the verifying faculty of the Christian consciousness," and in another place that it is to be found in the principle that God never reveals anything supernaturally that we could possibly find out by our own normal powers. The value of this latter principle may be estimated by asking the Dean of Canterbury whether everything in the Bible has been supernaturally revealed by God for which there exists no sufficient ordinary evidence. Unless he is prepared to affirm this, his principle leaves us exactly where it found us, and this is precisely what the Dean, instead of affirming, denies; for his fundamental contention is that the credibility of the Bible is to be tested by the same rules as we apply to all other writings. And here again we must ask, how does this last position agree with his theory of "the verifying faculty of the Christian consciousness?"

For in testing the credibility of ordinary human writings such a faculty is quite unknown. Let us, however, waive these objections, and consider on its own merits the theory of the "Christian consciousness," as our ultimate and authoritative guide. The first question we shall have to ask with regard to it is: By what means does this verifying faculty speak to us? And to this question the Dean gives two contradictory answers. In one place he speaks of this faculty as though it were seated in the heart or soul of each individual Christian who devoutly reads the Bible. Elsewhere he reminds us that this faculty equally devoutly draws from their individual study of it the most grotesquely opposite conclusions; and he gives us to understand that what he means by the Christian consciousness is exclusively expressed in those beliefs as to which all Christians agree. But here again another question arises—a question which is raised by the Dean of Canterbury himself. How is the fact of this binding agreement to be known? In the first place, says the Dean, no agreement is binding, if it is general only in any one branch of the Church. If any belief thus authenticated "is rejected by other acknowledged branches, it is not an essential part of the Christian faith." But this, he continues, is by no means the whole of the truth. For it may have been ratified by the agreement of the entire Christian world in any particular age, "and may for many ages have been held by their predecessors;" but yet if ultimately any recognized branch rejects it, the agreement was illusory and not complete, and the authoritative Christian conscience was not really represented by it. It might well seem that, in this case, we could never be certain of anything; and that, however willing we might be to submit to what the Christian consciousness dictates to us, it is impossible to distinguish what it did dictate from what it did not. The Dean of Canterbury, however, informs us that the Protestant theory of authority provides us with some definite means by which this necessary distinction may be drawn. Those doctrines are essential, are final, and are really ratified by the Christian consciousness, which have been formally sanctioned and those doctrines only. But what, according to the Dean, does this formal sanction consist of? Does it consist of the decisions of Councils? It certainly does not do that; for he follows the English Articles in distinctly repudiating their authority; and yet he indicates that this sanction is embodied in definite formularies. How, then, are these formularies settled? And where are we to find examples of them? Of how they are settled the Dean tells us nothing; but he does give us examples of them; and he does more than that—he indicates that they are the only examples in existence. These examples are the three creeds. Of how the Christian consciousness which expressed itself in the three creeds ever again to speak with the same authority, and help us to answer the new order of difficulties which modern knowledge, as he admits, is daily forcing on us, he tells us nothing. Indeed, he has nothing to tell us. It is possible to imagine a more pitiable failure than this to supply Christianity with a living intellectual basis?

LORD HALIFAX'S VIEW OF THE LIVING EXTERNAL AUTHORITY.

It will, however, be said that the Dean of Canterbury represents the opinions of one school of Protestants only. And in some respects so he does; but it happens that as to this question of authority, no other Protestant school is in any better position. Indeed, so far as the Church, in its present condition, is concerned, the arguments of all other schools are substantially the same as his. This is very clearly shown by certain recent utterances of Lord Halifax, who has endeavored to set up a standard of universal Catholic teaching, which should override, on occasion, the decisions of the English courts, and even the authority of the English Bishop of Exeter. The leader of the extreme High Church party uses almost the same language as the Low Church or Broad Church dean. He appeals with equal vagueness to the agreement of all branches of the Church, as the true test and source of what is really Catholic teaching, though, unlike the Dean, he implies that this agreement, instead of being confined to the Creeds of the first three centuries, still speaks for our guidance with a living voice to day. But of what it speaks, how

it speaks and when it speaks, he can formulate no theory which does not, as an unintended result, reduce his own position to an absurdity. This was well pointed out by a writer in the *Dublin Review*, who shows that there is not one of Lord Halifax's claims for Anglicanism which is not repudiated by an overwhelming majority of Christians. This is not the place, as I have said already, to urge these arguments against the Protestant position in detail. I will, however, call attention to a few facts, which form a practical illustration of their truth, and which show how, under the stress of scientific criticism, no Christian agreement of any kind exists which does actually supply Protestants with even the basis of any common doctrine.

PROTESTANT TEACHERS DIFFER.—The Dean of Canterbury, and his school, altogether reject the sacredotal theory of a miracle-working priesthood. Lord Halifax and his school maintain not only that such a priesthood was ordained by Christ, and is sustained by the Holy Ghost, but also that its existence is essential to the life of the Christian Church, and that no church is a branch of the Catholic Church without it. Canon Gore maintains that, however scientific criticism may alter, in some respects, our view of the Scripture narrative, it does nothing that ever to weaken the evidences of Christ's divinity. He gives us to understand, it is true, that when he speaks of scientific criticism, he means such criticism when uninfused by an animus against Christianity. We will, therefore, compare his views with those of a critic as religious as himself—a critic, moreover, who joins with Canon Gore in declaring that scientific criticism, as applied to the New Testament is by no means, as many suppose, "increasingly radical" in its results. Professor Harnack (for it is he I allude to) declares that it does nothing to alter the main lineaments of the personality of Christ, and the true point of His sayings. But what, when he says this, does Professor Harnack mean? He means, as we find on referring to another passage, that this scientific criticism, which he regards as so undestructive, has destroyed all events our belief in three things—the miraculous birth of Christ, His resurrection, and His ascension. What shall we say, then, of any Protestant doctrine of agreement—of the claim that any living authority is present within the Protestant church which preserves the Christian doctrine intact amid the critical storm—when the very men who are the most eager to put this authority forward, are found to be contradicting each other with regard to the very rudiments of the faith which this authority imposes on them, and can not agree that it imposes on them even a belief in the resurrection of their Lord?

SCIENCE DESTROYS PROTESTANTISM.—Such is the condition to which, as an intellectual system, Protestantism is being reduced by the solvent touch of science; and year by year, as scientific knowledge increases, and as the consciousness of what it means becomes clearer and more diffused, the intellectual bankruptcy of Protestantism becomes more and more evident. The position of Rome, on the other hand, is being affected in a precisely opposite way. In exact proportion as Protestantism exhibits its inability to vindicate for itself, either in theory or in practice, any teaching authority which is really an authority at all, the perfection of the Roman system, theoretically and practically alike, becomes in this particular respect more and more striking and obvious.

In the first place, the effect of science on the external evidences of Christianity being, as we have seen on the admission of Protestants themselves, to rob these evidences of their inherent doctrinal definiteness, a living authority which shall interpret and fix their meaning, and also confront objectors with some reasonable theory of itself, is now being recognized, with a clearness unparalleled in former ages, as the sole foundation on which any doctrinal Christianity can be supported.

In the second place, the logical completeness with which this foundation is supplied by Rome is, in consequence of this fact, being brought into increasing prominence.

In the third place, this complete-

ARRESTED A 2 YEAR OLD BOY.

Pittsburg, Pa.—George Shaffer, 2 years old, was arrested on a warrant and charged with trespassing. A neighbor swore that George tore up his lawn and flower beds. But the Court declined to hear the case. The little son of Mrs. John Cline of Aylmer, Ont., was only a year older than baby Shaffer when his mother noticed that he suffered with severe attacks of biliousness. She tried everything she could think of, but the boy grew steadily worse. "I cannot praise Fruit-a-tives too highly," writes Mrs. Cline. "I have tried many different kinds of medicine for my son. He has had bilious attacks ever since he was three years old, and since he began to take 'Fruit-a-tives' he has been so well." "Fruit-a-tives" are the ideal medicine for children, as well as grown folk. They are pleasant to take and mild in action—being made of fruit juices and tonics. 50c a box. At all dealers.

ness is being emphasized yet farther by the ignominious failure of Protestantism to provide any equivalent. Who can conceive of four Catholic theologians, all claiming to speak in the name of the Church of Rome, but holding opposite views, and expressing them with equal vehemence, as to the nature of the priesthood, as to the sacraments, the authority of General Councils, and even as to the question whether Christ rose from the dead? The idea is absurd. There are many doctrinal questions as to which even Rome has as yet defined nothing; but the doctrines which she has defined she has defined clearly and forever; and she will forever stand by these definitions, or will fall by them.

INTELLECTUAL CONSISTENCY OF ROME.

In this way it is, then, that modern historical criticism is working to establish, so far as intellectual consistency is concerned, the Roman theory of Christianity, and to destroy the theory of Protestantism for it shows that Christian doctrine can neither be defined nor verified except by an authority which, as both logic and experience prove, Rome alone can with any plausibility claim. To vindicate, however, the Roman theory of authority as a theory of Christianity, which is logically consistent in itself, is but half of the task which lies before the Roman apologist. He will have to show not only that this theory is logically consistent with itself, its postulates having been once admitted, but that also its postulates are in their turn consistent with the tendencies of scientific knowledge. This consideration brings us to a new aspect of the question, and here we shall discover in a yet more striking way the unique capacity of Rome for defending the Christian faith and, without being false to any one of its present principles, turning modern science into its principle witness and supporter.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Modern Protestants, those especially of the Broad Church school, have shown themselves anxious to appropriate the word "evolution," and apply it in various ways to Christianity, and the moral life; but they are generally equipped with the loosest conception of what evolution, in a scientific sense, is. They regard it merely as a technical synonym for development, or at all events for such development as arises from struggle, and from the survival of the fittest. They fail to lay stress on the two most important facts which evolutionary science reveals to us in the natural world; namely, the nature of the development, as apart from its various causes, which takes place in organisms; and the fact that social aggregates, in their lower developments and their higher, are themselves organisms, no less truly than individuals, and evolve in accordance with precisely similar laws.

EVOLUTION—WHAT IS IT ACCORDING TO SCIENCE?

Now if we turn to Mr. Herbert Spencer we shall find this process of organic evolution described as a process of change from a condition of heterogeneous homogeneity to one of homogeneous heterogeneity. That

CONTINUED ON PAGE EIGHT.

Sacred Heart Academy

LONDON, CANADA

THE AIM OF THE RELIGIOUS OF THE Sacred Heart is to give to their pupils an education which will prepare them to fill worthily the places for which Divine Providence destines them. The training of character and cultivation of manners are therefore considered matters of primary importance, and the health of the pupils is the object of constant solicitude. Active physical exercise is insisted upon.

The course of studies comprises a thorough English education; a complete course of Christian Doctrine, Elements of Christian Philosophy, Ancient and Modern History, special attention being given to Sacred and Church History, Literature, Ancient and Modern, Latin, Mathematics and the Natural Sciences, Freehand Drawing. The study of French is free of charge; also, if desired, the preparation for the Entrance and Junior Leaving Examinations. The Musical Course fits pupils for the examinations of the London Conservatory of Music.

TERMS:

Entrance Fee.....	\$ 5.00
Board and Tuition per Scholastic year (10 months).....	150.00
Washing.....	20.00
Bedding.....	10.00
Use of Library.....	2.00

For further particulars, address:

Reverend Mother Superior,
P. O. Box, 320, London, Canada