

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$2.00 per annum. THOS. COFFEY, LL. D., Editor and Publisher.

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order. Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Ogdensburg, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Messrs. Luke King, P. J. Neven, E. J. Broderick, M. J. Hagarty and Miss Sara Hanley are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transmit all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD. Agent for Newfoundland, Mr. James Power of St. John's. Agent for the district of Mississauga, Mr. M. Reynolds, New Liskeard.

Subscribers changing residence will please give old as well as new address. Ordinary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.

When subscribers ask for their paper at the post office it would be well were they to tell the clerk to give them their CATHOLIC RECORD. We have information of cardholders in a few places on the part of delivery clerks who will sometimes look for letters only.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION. Apostolic Delegation. Ottawa, June 13th, 1905.

Mr. Thomas Coffey. My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper, and I have noted with satisfaction that it is directed with intelligence and ability, and above all, that it is imbued with a strong Catholic spirit.

It strenuously defends Catholic principles and rights, and stands firmly by the teaching and authority of the Church, at the same time promoting the best interests of the country. Following these lines it has done a great deal of good for more and more, as its wholesome influence reaches more Catholic homes. I therefore, earnestly recommend it to Catholic families. With my blessing commend it to your work, and best wishes for its continued success.

Yours very sincerely in Christ, DONATUS, Archbishop of Ephesus, Apostolic Delegate.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA. Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1906.

Mr. Thomas Coffey. 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. Its manner and form are both good; and a truly Catholic spirit pervades the whole. 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. FALCONIO, Arch. of Larissa, Apost. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JULY 31, 1906.

THE CHURCH AND THE BIBLE.

Amongst the deposits of faith and grace few more precious than the Bible have been entrusted to the Church. Nor have any been preserved with deeper reverence or greater care. It is not now, only when printing makes the task comparatively easy, that the Church has devoted some of her profound scholars to the study of the holy books. Through the middle ages and those which preceded, when copying was a life work, and when volumes were the fruit of years of labor, her monks saved and multiplied what otherwise had perished. The sixteenth century brought a new difficulty. This was the outcome of private judgment. Once the Bible was put in the hands of everyone and placed on a level with ordinary books it was exposed to irreparable desecration. Its text was subject to radical criticism. Its interpretation became the weathercock of every wind of doctrine. No authority was placed upon the seat of judgment. Private opinion, self-appointed study, rose to make charges and decide questions. The court became a lobby of confusion instead of a hall of learning and religion. We have fallen upon evil days. Presbyterians have thrown out the Bible. Dr. Wylie, of the Scotch Presbyterian Church of New York, warned his people that they were in danger of losing the Bible. He admitted that it was ignored almost entirely by the great colleges and universities of the United States. These same Presbyterians should not be allowed to forget their trumped-up charges against the Church about chaining the Bible. Not that the Catholic Church ever did chain the Bible in the sense of keeping it from the people. This they know who upraid us with it. She may have used this practical mode, when books were scarce, of giving every one a chance to drink of the fountain. We see the same method in public parks. Private judgment is accountable for divided Christianity. Another weakness it manifests. It is not able to save the sacred volume from the analysis of rationalism. Having no standard of its own, the exaggerated subjectivism of Protestantism knows not when or where to stop and has no power to insist upon its demands. As a consequence the Bible, the only treasure of Protestant Christianity, is without a defence. Science and higher criticism have loosened the hold which the Bible had upon the public mind. They have turned its history into allegories and its laws into fables. What they have done with the Book has recoiled upon the Divine Author. It must have a protection. The very fact that the battle of scholarship is keener to-day about the religious citadels is a reason. The sterner prospect that worse danger threatens God's revelation impresses us more with this necessity. Upon holy Church rests the uninterrupted obligation of protecting the Bible. And our venerable Pontiff, Pius X., by his Apostolic Letter, dated May 7th of this year, has come forth to show the zeal of the Church for Biblical studies and its anxiety to give an answer to the scientific criticism of these times. It is one of the most important acts of his historical reign. For several years his illustrious predecessor, Leo XIII., had cherished

the idea of creating a Biblical University. Poverty prevented Leo from carrying out the plan. For the present Pope Pius X. contents himself with establishing an institute which will form as the brief expresses it, "a centre for the higher studies relating to the Sacred Books, designed to promote in the most efficacious way biblical learning and to form able writers and professors on all biblical matters." The President of this new Institute is Father Leopold Fonk, a distinguished Biblical scholar. He was born in 1865 at Wisen, on the borders between Germany and Holland. As a boy he showed a special bent for Oriental languages. From 1883 to 1890 he followed the courses of philosophy and theology in the Gregorian University in Rome. In 1892 he entered the Society of Jesus. After his first year of probation he was started again upon his favorite studies. He spent two years in England mainly with a critical study of the Hebrew text and of the various versions of the Old Testament. Then he went to the Orient, and afterwards for three years to the Universities of Berlin and Munich. In 1901 he was appointed by the Austrian government as Ordinary professor of the New Testament. Last year he went to Rome to teach scripture in the Gregorian University. He is the author of several learned works. He is the man for the position. Nor has he been idle since his appointment. He has issued a short inaugural defining the importance and scope of the Biblical Institute. The feverish ardor of our adversaries, both within and without the Church, to diffuse their ideas contrary to traditional doctrine and Catholic faith concerning the sacred books, the boasts of progress and the fruits of learned investigations are reasons for the importance of the new Institute. "In the name of this modern science," writes Father Fonk, "both the educated and the unsophisticated are asked to believe that the ancient persuasion of Catholic tradition has become antiquated and no longer adapted for modern times." The danger which is contained in these demands of science has a double cause; first, that there has really been considerable advance through excavations and discoveries, and secondly, from the fact that Catholics have neglected these special points of study. As a consequence they depend in some points of defence and interpretation of the holy books upon these heterodox writings. In the mind of the Holy Father the new Biblical Institute is destined to provide a timely and efficacious remedy for these needs of the Church. The scope is threefold. It is in the first place to form Catholic professors and writers for Biblical sciences. To furnish youths and others with all useful aids for advancement in the study of Sacred Scripture forms the second scope. A special library containing all works, ancient and modern, upon Scriptural subjects, is to be established in the Institute for this purpose. To this library will be added a Biblical museum for the illustration of the sacred text. With the second scope is united the third, that of defending, explaining and propagating sound Catholic teaching on the Sacred Scriptures in opposition to modern errors. For this end publications will be issued and public conferences will be held on various problems relating to the Bible. Thus does the Holy Father, by establishing this Institute, protest to the world that the Church, besides protecting God's Revelation, is a friend of true learning and progress. Let us conclude with Father Fonk's closing paragraph: "We trust that the Catholic world will also aid with generous charity the great designs of the Supreme Pontiff. Thus the Pontifical Biblical Institute will become a fount of blessings for the whole Church, and become itself a fruitful vine planted by the Lord: 'Visit this vineyard and perfect the same which Thy right hand hath planted.' (Ps. 79.)"

nothing in the feast itself; nor is there any spirit of discord in the celebrants of St. Patrick's Day. The trouble originated with those whose hearts were ever bitter and whose lips are ever ready with curses for what the brave sons of Ireland hold dearest. There is no excuse for comparing the two days. Orangeism has nothing to do with William III. It was begotten of religious hatred and nursed by Protestant ascendency a hundred years after William's battle. We hope the Globe will revise its Irish history. The 12th of July has as much to do with St. Andrew's day as it has with the 17th of March. By what course of reasoning can the Globe say that: "Those who celebrate on the 17th of March doubtless cherish as many misconceptions as do those who march on the twelfth?" When people close their eyes to the origin, the significance and purpose of Orangeism—when they distort these things and strive to transfer them into national holidays—when they flatter what they should rebuke, then union is farther removed and peace too dearly purchased. An Orange celebration is an open taunt to every Irish Catholic, which may be silently tolerated, but whose insult is none the less felt. Orangeism will, wherever it is encouraged, be a sword of division.

The second extract is a passing word from Goldwin Smith. Nothing so haunts the old Professor as the thought of Papal usurpation and the Jesuits: these are the bane of Christendom, the one and only excuse for Orangeism. "Let the display of political force be pointed, not against the faith of Catholic fellow-Christians, but against those two banes of Christendom, Papal usurpation and the Jesuits." When Goldwin Smith looks to the heroes of a Twelfth of July celebration for protection he is really scared. He knows very well that the papacy never usurped anything and that the Jesuits are amongst the most learned and virtuous of the Catholic clergy. We did expect better things of the Oxford Professor. To think any historian would take consolation in a raffish organization passes our pity and wins only our contempt. Bismarck pulled hard with as strong a rope as nationalism could twine to tear down the tower of the Catholic Church. He was advised by one who had tried to effect the same purpose, for nearly two thousand years, to stop. What would be this being's counsel to the man who would try to destroy this same tower with an Orange ribbon? Most likely his satanic majesty would pass the workmen by with the word of the play: "What fools these mortals be."

ANGLICAN BOUNDARIES.

We return to this question. It consists in examining whether the Ecclesia Anglicana maintains the same limits since the so-called reformation as before. We saw that Henry usurped to himself the primacy of order and jurisdiction which before his time had been held by the Roman pontiff. In the former Church it was acknowledged that the bishops derived from Christ their spiritual power, which they were bound to exercise independently of any temporal authority. The old order passed away. The bishops of the post-reformation order were creatures of the crown. They were appointed like civil officers by letters patent. "We, the Sovereign of England, name, make, and create them bishops." "We empower them to confer orders, to exercise all manner of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and to do all that appertains to the episcopal or pastoral office, over and above the things known to have been committed to him by God in the Scriptures, in place of us, in our name, and by our royal authority." The forms of worship were changed. The altar was turned into a table and the sacrifice of the Mass, though authorized at first, was expelled to make room for a new liturgy. A book of common prayer was composed and enjoined upon every church with penalties for disobedience. It did not satisfy the Calvinistic Cranmer and his party. A new edition was ordered differing still more from the old liturgy. Prayer for the dead was dropped from the communion service, the visitation of the sick was omitted, and great care was taken to exclude the several allusions which the liturgy still contained to the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Nor were the Churches the same in matter of doctrine. If the old Church be compared with the forty-two articles composed in King Edward's reign they contradict each other in several points. These forty-articles cannot be gotten over. They were published by the authority of the head of the Church. The clergy had to subscribe to them. And no man could obtain his university degree without swearing to their truth and pledging himself to defend them in all places as agreeing with the word of God. This was the English Church under Edward VI. and Cranmer. The boundary line by this chief adviser of England's spiritual head was surely away from the old limits. Queen Mary succeeded Edward. Under her sceptre the

NEWSPAPER COMMENTS ON THE TWELFTH.

The first of these which we select for notice is an editorial from the Toronto Globe—which congratulates Toronto upon the mellowed observances and memories of the Twelfth of July. "One," says the Daily Globe, "does not need to have been long a dweller in Toronto to recall that both the 12th of July and the 17th of March were days when considerable disorder might be looked for." Why these two days are contrasted is due to ignorance. There is no parallelism between them—unless it be the mere fact that Orangeism had its start in Ireland, which was likewise the scene of St. Patrick's apostolic labors. A faithful people—scattered indeed and persecuted for their religion—have been, and are, in the habit of celebrating the conversion of their Island forefathers to Christianity. If on some of these anniversaries Toronto has witnessed disorders the cause should be laid at the right door. That door is neither the Church nor St. Patrick's hall. It is the Orange lodge. There is

nothing in the feast itself; nor is there any spirit of discord in the celebrants of St. Patrick's Day. The trouble originated with those whose hearts were ever bitter and whose lips are ever ready with curses for what the brave sons of Ireland hold dearest. There is no excuse for comparing the two days. Orangeism has nothing to do with William III. It was begotten of religious hatred and nursed by Protestant ascendency a hundred years after William's battle. We hope the Globe will revise its Irish history. The 12th of July has as much to do with St. Andrew's day as it has with the 17th of March. By what course of reasoning can the Globe say that: "Those who celebrate on the 17th of March doubtless cherish as many misconceptions as do those who march on the twelfth?" When people close their eyes to the origin, the significance and purpose of Orangeism—when they distort these things and strive to transfer them into national holidays—when they flatter what they should rebuke, then union is farther removed and peace too dearly purchased. An Orange celebration is an open taunt to every Irish Catholic, which may be silently tolerated, but whose insult is none the less felt. Orangeism will, wherever it is encouraged, be a sword of division.

The second extract is a passing word from Goldwin Smith. Nothing so haunts the old Professor as the thought of Papal usurpation and the Jesuits: these are the bane of Christendom, the one and only excuse for Orangeism. "Let the display of political force be pointed, not against the faith of Catholic fellow-Christians, but against those two banes of Christendom, Papal usurpation and the Jesuits." When Goldwin Smith looks to the heroes of a Twelfth of July celebration for protection he is really scared. He knows very well that the papacy never usurped anything and that the Jesuits are amongst the most learned and virtuous of the Catholic clergy. We did expect better things of the Oxford Professor. To think any historian would take consolation in a raffish organization passes our pity and wins only our contempt. Bismarck pulled hard with as strong a rope as nationalism could twine to tear down the tower of the Catholic Church. He was advised by one who had tried to effect the same purpose, for nearly two thousand years, to stop. What would be this being's counsel to the man who would try to destroy this same tower with an Orange ribbon? Most likely his satanic majesty would pass the workmen by with the word of the play: "What fools these mortals be."

ANGLICAN BOUNDARIES.

We return to this question. It consists in examining whether the Ecclesia Anglicana maintains the same limits since the so-called reformation as before. We saw that Henry usurped to himself the primacy of order and jurisdiction which before his time had been held by the Roman pontiff. In the former Church it was acknowledged that the bishops derived from Christ their spiritual power, which they were bound to exercise independently of any temporal authority. The old order passed away. The bishops of the post-reformation order were creatures of the crown. They were appointed like civil officers by letters patent. "We, the Sovereign of England, name, make, and create them bishops." "We empower them to confer orders, to exercise all manner of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and to do all that appertains to the episcopal or pastoral office, over and above the things known to have been committed to him by God in the Scriptures, in place of us, in our name, and by our royal authority." The forms of worship were changed. The altar was turned into a table and the sacrifice of the Mass, though authorized at first, was expelled to make room for a new liturgy. A book of common prayer was composed and enjoined upon every church with penalties for disobedience. It did not satisfy the Calvinistic Cranmer and his party. A new edition was ordered differing still more from the old liturgy. Prayer for the dead was dropped from the communion service, the visitation of the sick was omitted, and great care was taken to exclude the several allusions which the liturgy still contained to the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist. Nor were the Churches the same in matter of doctrine. If the old Church be compared with the forty-two articles composed in King Edward's reign they contradict each other in several points. These forty-articles cannot be gotten over. They were published by the authority of the head of the Church. The clergy had to subscribe to them. And no man could obtain his university degree without swearing to their truth and pledging himself to defend them in all places as agreeing with the word of God. This was the English Church under Edward VI. and Cranmer. The boundary line by this chief adviser of England's spiritual head was surely away from the old limits. Queen Mary succeeded Edward. Under her sceptre the

NEWSPAPER COMMENTS ON THE TWELFTH.

The first of these which we select for notice is an editorial from the Toronto Globe—which congratulates Toronto upon the mellowed observances and memories of the Twelfth of July. "One," says the Daily Globe, "does not need to have been long a dweller in Toronto to recall that both the 12th of July and the 17th of March were days when considerable disorder might be looked for." Why these two days are contrasted is due to ignorance. There is no parallelism between them—unless it be the mere fact that Orangeism had its start in Ireland, which was likewise the scene of St. Patrick's apostolic labors. A faithful people—scattered indeed and persecuted for their religion—have been, and are, in the habit of celebrating the conversion of their Island forefathers to Christianity. If on some of these anniversaries Toronto has witnessed disorders the cause should be laid at the right door. That door is neither the Church nor St. Patrick's hall. It is the Orange lodge. There is

new church was swept away. The supremacy was transferred back again to the Pope. All the men of the new learning who had been made Bishops were removed and their places filled by others attached to the ancient worship. In the first year of Mary's reign a statute was passed repealing all the changes made under her brother. Religion was placed on exactly the same footing as it had stood before the quarrel of Henry with Rome. Are the various points in the same straight line? The Church of England before the quarrel, the Church of England at the death of Henry, at the death of Edward VI, and during the reign of Mary; are these all the same continuous Church? One and the same straight line? That question is not so easily answered. Anglicans do not care to have the point pressed. If they admit the Church under Mary there is an end to all claim of apostolic succession; for Elizabeth destroyed what Mary had repaired. The chain is broken. They would have us believe that under Mary the Church of England was enchained by a schismatical prelate and clergy. Queen Mary left the Church to itself. She renounced all claim to its government, simply undid what had been done by her father and brother, cleared away the innovations of the reformers and restored the religion of former days to its place in the land.

CLEMENCEAU DEFEATED.

After three years of tyrannical power Clemenceau, the Premier of France, has been defeated. What was the immediate cause of his fall is not easily discerned. Some say that it was political suicide. Clemenceau had upset many ministries. He then performed the extraordinary feat of upsetting his own government. Hardly likely. Politicians are not pessimists to that extent. They are always under the conviction that their own tenure of office is the country's safety. Clemenceau had started and maintained the war against the Church with cunning and implacable bitterness. That did not affect his standing. What did weaken him was the broken hope of the workmen who expected from the spoliation of the communities some old age pensions. These never materialized. Then there were the labor strikes in which the Premier held out the hand of pity to the working men and took force into the other hand with which to knock them down. It was, however, Clemenceau's tongue which generally got him into trouble, even though it did serve him as a keen weapon of attack. A time came when he thought he could use it upon the Chamber of Deputies. He tried it, failed and was voted out. The debate was upon the naval scandals. A promise having been made that reforms would be introduced the Chamber was ready to vote confidence in the Government. Clemenceau, smarting under the criticisms of his old adversary Delcasse, who had led the attack, and still thinking he could hold the chamber, opened fire upon Delcasse, the ex-minister of Foreign Affairs in 1905. He had been thrown overboard at the dictation of Germany. Clemenceau taunted him with having led France to humiliation at Algiers. A duel of angry words followed. Delcasse accused Clemenceau of giving France to the foreign press. Clemenceau hurled back the denial, adding that Delcasse had brought the country to the verge of war without preparation. A vote was taken, with two hundred and twelve for the government and two hundred and seventy-six against. The latest despatches from France tell us that the Premier has asked M. Briand, Minister of Justice and Worship, to form a new Cabinet. M. Briand is a Socialist. Poor France appears to be going from bad to worse.

A PRESBYTERIAN SERMON ON THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

We print elsewhere an interesting sermon upon the Catholic Church preached by a Rev. Dr. Rayson in the Presbyterian Church of Blind River, Ont., on June 13th. The interest we take in this discourse is its rare candour, and the correct sources from which it derives its information. Too frequently Protestant pulpits have sought their accounts of the Catholic Church from wells poisoned by absurd ghosts and mingled with the errors of antiquated imagination. On the other hand, Dr. Rayson, admitting that many of the things with which she is branded she does not believe or teach at all, says that if people wish to know her doctrine they must go to the fountain head. "The only way to understand a Church's position or doctrine is to let her define it." If all Dr. Rayson's brethren would follow his advice a tremendous expanse of ignorance would make way for the light of justice and the right understanding of the Catholic Church. No one ought to fear the result. A cause cannot be based upon malignant error or supported by false testimony. Better is the candour which sees good where former prejudice

beheld nothing but evil than the continued poison administered by selfish bigotry. It may, though it should not, cost something to give expression in a Presbyterian pulpit, to such sentiments. They are a slight reparation for the many things which have for generations been said about us. But there are some things which we cannot let go without a word. We could not expect Dr. Rayson to understand thoroughly the doctrine and discipline of the Church, or fairly to estimate the relations between Church and State. We take two examples. He gives us credit for "sharing liberally in the growing light of this century." What is this particular beam of incandescent visual glory we know not. The truths of the Church have been hers from the beginning. Hers the full deposit of faith, hers the ever-abiding Teacher and Paraclete, hers the unfailing treasure of grace and salvation. The question is not historical. The question is of principle. It is not whether the Church has ever changed her doctrine, but whether it was at all possible for her to do it. If the commission was left by Christ to Peter's unfailing faith then must every disciple and every seeker of truth turn to that source for the light of life. Discipline may change, for the ocean of grace and mercy is inexhaustible. Doctrine, on the contrary, remains forever immutable. That which was entrusted to the apostles and delivered to the saints is still the faith of our fathers and the inheritance of all Christian people. Whatever progress may mark this century it leaves Catholic doctrine upon the Incarnation and Redemption and all other points of belief untouched and unchanged. Time does not wear away at a single grain the Rock. The Church is never hostile to real progress, although she does not hesitate to condemn certain false theories of progress. Nor is the Church afraid of freedom and separation from the State, although she ever claims to be above the State: as the supernatural is above the natural and the soul above the body. Taking Dr. Rayson's sermon all in all there is much to commend and little to condemn. It would be well for religious truth if more of his brethren would quote from Cardinal Gibbons when preaching on the Catholic Church.

STILL THEY COME. Ever at Revelstoke, B. C., Rev. W. C. Calder, claiming to be a Christian minister, and preaching in a Christian Church, to a body of Orangemen, who also claim to be Christians, spoke words which besmirched his cloth. We have the old, old story. The preacher claimed he had no enmity to that powerful organization (meaning the Catholic Church) but it was plain that it was aiming at the supreme control of the whole continent of North America. Well indeed would it be for the whole continent of North America were this the case. We would then have a Christian unity dear to the heart of our Saviour, and Christianity in tatters would no longer grieve those who sincerely love Our Lord. But what evidence has the reverend gentleman for advancing such a sweeping statement. None whatever. This has simply become a parrot cry with certain preachers with sparse congregations. If the Catholic Church is using every lawful effort to spread its influence why should fault be found? Is not every church in the land working along the same line? Rev. Mr. Calder roundly condemned Sir Wilfred Laurier for truckling to the Papacy in saddling Separate Schools upon Alberta and Saskatchewan. Here we have a Christian minister objecting to the teaching of Christianity in the schools and placing himself upon record as a friend of godless institutions of learning. A strange Christian minister indeed is Rev. W. C. Calder. Grievous it is that we have so many like him who pander to the prejudices of the tumultuous mob and become enemies of that peace and good will which every Christian and every Canadian should do his utmost to promote.

AN IMPRESSION is abroad that because some disgraceful exhibitions of grafting have been brought before the courts in Montreal, and that some of those accused bear French names, it follows that the delinquents are of the Catholic faith. Such, however, is not the case. It will be remembered that one witness, a Frenchman, swore he could not give certain evidence because it would injure a brother Mason. We do not deny that some Catholics may be mixed up in the execrable business. They have brought disgrace upon their Church, upon their country and upon their families. This gives us another very cogent reason why the electors should be more careful in the selection of men for public positions. A man who has the drink habit, and a shady character in many other regards, is, as a rule, a great canvasser. He gets the name of a "good fellow" because the wine clerk has an intimate acquaintance with him and oftentimes he asks the boys up to have a drink. Not that he cares at all about the boys, but

he wants their votes, and the boys who go up to drink are, as a rule, very indifferent who they vote for at election time. This unprincipled conduct is what gives us such a bulky undesirable class occupying public positions. The man who on election day is guided solely by good fellowship of the kind we have mentioned does not deserve to have a vote.

BISHOP GARRIGAN, of Sioux City, Iowa, is no friend of the grog shops. "It is quite evident," he says, "that the saloon is a great menace to society and does not intend to be governed by State laws, city ordinances or police control. It boldly defies law and constitutional authority, and, regardless of God and man, leads on its procession of unfortunate victims to temporal and eternal destruction." The Bishop is quite correct in his conclusions. It is an evil that is and must continue to be grappled with. All classes of people fully recognize the degradation it brings upon the community. How to deal with it is the question of questions. Sooner or later, we hope, a successful effort will be made to stem the tide of misery and criminality generated by its existence. We know of some cities in Canada where licenses are given in plenty about the market places. The liquor people and license commissioners tell us that it is necessary to have stable accommodation for the farmers, and tumble down piles of boards are put in places for this purpose. The so-called hotel people care not at all for the revenue derived from the stable. It is in their bar-rooms that the roaring business is done where many farmers and farmers' sons receive their first initiation along the lines of debauchery.

IT IS THE FASHION now-a-days in the large cities to abandon churches situated in the poorer districts or slums. At the meeting of the Pan Presbyterian alliance held in New York recently Rev. Mr. Conrad of Baltimore created a sensation by stating that the Protestants were selling out down town and abandoning the poor quarters of cities, seeking rich congregations. The Catholics, he said, on the contrary, kept up their parishes. Large audiences, he added, are not always a sign of vigorous church life, and the efforts to attract them by various means very often leads away from the real aim of the gospel. Even the Salvation Army, he claims, has lost its power of saving souls through its expansion into economic fields. Many years ago the Jesuits of Chicago erected a beautiful structure in the midst of a foreign element in that city which had been noted for drunkenness and all manner of disorderly conduct. Criticized for such a course, the good Fathers well said that the district in which they had erected the church was the place where work was to be done.

THE WORLD over will be re-echoed the splendid tribute which the Archbishop of Boston recently paid the Sisterhood of the Catholic Church. It was delivered at one of the sessions of the Educational Convention held a few weeks ago in that city. His Grace said: "One has not a vocabulary to express the sentiments one feels in the presence of these noble women. Each one of those varied habits tells a story. But the mild story of all is devotion to this great free of Catholic education. We see the patient faces, the wearied bodies, but there is a spirit of faith in the eye which says, 'I will work until I die in this glorious calling in which I have been placed to help the Church.' We ask the world to come here and look at this spectacle. There are no such spectacles outside of the Catholic Church. There are other glorious things. I do not wish to retract. There are millions of men and women outside of the Catholic Church doing wonderful things for God, too, since every good thing is for Him. But when I look at this united body of women, ever patient, never self-seeking, content with everything, self-sacrificing along under the most difficult circumstances without a word of complaint, living in houses almost unfit for habitation, sometimes eating food that is scarcely the nourishment one would pick out for hard-working women. I tell you I haven't the words to express my admiration, yes, far more than that, my veneration, for these noble women of God."

A NON-CATHOLIC EDITOR in one of the London papers says that he has never been able to understand what value there can be in religious exercises which can only be hammered into the public by adventitious and inappropriate means. He has no sympathy with the select choirs or the organ recitals, and he has but contempt for the dissolving views and cinematograph shows in this connection. It is a sad reflection, he continues, on a Christian country when what should be the impulse and desire of a man's soul can be forced upon him only through the medium of clap trap advertisements. This is hard hitting, especially at some of the Baptist ministers, who are decidedly up-to-date in yellow advertising of their churches. But the latest and most remarkable scheme for filling the empty pews is announced in one of the Western States. The pastor has added to the choir a couple of dozen canaries.