

FOOTSTEPS IN THE WARD.

A True Story. (FROM THE MONTH.)

Some fifteen or twenty years ago I was working as a trained nurse in one of our large hospitals, and had charge of the men's ward there. Not very long before I left a strange thing happened to me—a thing that I have never forgotten, but which, great as was the impression it made on my mind, I had no clue to the meaning of until later on, when I was received into the Catholic Church and instructed in her doctrine. Then I felt, rather than understood, something of what may perhaps have been the cause of all that occurred that night, though a complete explanation I must not expect on this side of the grave.

Though so long a time has elapsed since the incident I am about to relate to you, yet every detail of it is as clear and distinct in my mind as if it had happened yesterday. As I have said, I was not a Catholic, nor had I at that time any intention of entering the Church; some of my best friends, however, were Catholics, people whom I knew to be thoroughly good and sincere, and in consequence, I had ever felt a great respect for their faith, and on entering the hospital, had always done what I could to assist those patients whom I knew to be Catholics by seeing that they had all the consolations of their religion whenever it was possible. Many a time have I quietly let the priest who visited the hospital know that such or such a patient who had just come in was "a Roman," and often have I put the screen up when he was sitting by a bed and I saw that some poor fellow shrank from the gaze of curious eyes upon him, even though I knew quite well that the other patients were all really out of earshot. Father James and I were good friends, and though I never said much I knew very well the difference there was between his ministrations at a sick-bed and those of the Protestant parsons who were often about the place, and I should not more have thought of sending and asking for one of the latter when a man was dying, than I should have sent for—well, one of the gentlemen on the hospital committee!

But now for my story. Late one evening a man was brought in who had been terribly hurt by a fall from some scaffolding. It was a fearful case; his head and face had been badly cut, and though no bones were broken, there were some dreadful internal injuries, and the poor fellow was not expected to live through the night. As it happened, it was not my turn for the night nursing, but the nurse who should have been on duty had been taken ill the day before, and another had been appointed in her place. I myself had been up the greater part of the previous night, attending a very bad case, and had been hoping all the evening to get off to bed early and have a good sleep, for I was thoroughly tired out. But when I stood by that poor man's side after we had settled him, whilst the doctors were talking together at a little distance, and saw what a sad state of suffering he was in, and how indeed he looked as if he could not live many hours, my heart misgave me at the thought of leaving him to the temporary nurse, who was young and inexperienced. I watched him for a few moments, turning over in my mind what would be best to do, and just then Dr. M., the head surgeon, came up.

"Sister," he said, in his grave, courteous way (we nurses were always called "Sisters") "Sister, I hardly like to ask you, for I know you were up all last night, and have had a hard day's work to-day—but that man ought not to be left, and he wants some one who knows what she is about to be with him. Sister Maria there, you know, is new to the work and scarcely up to such a case as this; I fear I must ask you to undertake it."

I was glad enough to do so, for though the man—was a mason—was never even seen before, an odd feeling had suddenly come over me that I must stay and nurse him myself. I therefore made no difficulty, and the doctor promised to call in early the next morning. "Though," he added, "I really don't expect to find him alive."

He went away, and I called the second nurse, and we did what we could to make our patient comfortable. He was an oldish man, and, to judge from his appearance, was in pretty respectable circumstances, but there was a restless, hungry look in his eyes that was very distressing to see, as he fixed them first on my companion and then on myself, turning them all round the room and then as if looking for something. He did not speak, but I could not be sure whether that was from physical inability or because he did not choose to do so. The look on his face worried me, and I tried to help him by asking one or two questions—whether he had a wife or children, and if he wanted them—but he shook his head to everything, and presently lay still and closed his eyes in a sort of weary, disappointed way that was sad to behold. Of course his name and everything about him was on the card over his bed, but somehow or other, stupidly enough, in all the hurry and bustle of bringing him in, I had forgotten to look at it, and even now I never thought about doing so, though as a rule I always examined the cards carefully. But on this occasion the doctor's orders had been given verbally, so I suppose that had put it out of my head.

It was nearly 11 o'clock before all

the arrangements for the night were finished and the day-nurses had gone to bed, and I was alone with my patient. I say "alone," and practically I was so, for though the ward was a large one and nearly full, its inmates were all asleep or dozing, and the place was so quiet you might have heard a pin drop. Here and there a low moan or a restless sigh and movement would come from one of the beds, but there was no speaking, and the sufferer would soon subside into quiet again. I said my night prayers and then sat down to watch by the sick-bed.

I am neither a nervous nor an imaginative person, and am moreover possessed of what my friends call "the enviable faculty" of concentrating my whole mind on the work of the present moment, so that on occasions such as I am now describing I was too much absorbed in thinking about my patient and in watching to see whether I could relieve him in any way, to have time for fancies or nervous imaginations, which might perhaps have attacked persons of a more sensitive temperament during the long hours of lonely watch in that silent ward. But there was little that I could do; the poor fellow was fast getting beyond all human help, and I could only strive now and then to soothe his restlessness by a quiet touch, or moisten his parched lips at intervals with a few drops of cooling drink. He groaned and muttered a good deal, but I could not catch any coherent words; nevertheless, I had a strong conviction that he was all the time perfectly conscious, and that he wanted something, and that, moreover, he knew what he wanted, but either could not, or would not say what it was. Sometimes, when I was giving him a drink, he would open his eyes wide—and gaze at me with that same sad, questioning expression I had before observed, and which, without my quite knowing why, made me feel thoroughly unhappy. I suppose if I had been a Catholic, or had known more about the sacraments than I did then, I should have guessed at once what was the matter, but as it was, I did not know what to do to help him, so I said nothing and seemed to take no notice.

So the night wore on; midnight passed; 1 o'clock, then half-past 1 struck, the chimes of the big clock in the tower close by booming out with what seemed unusual loudness in the silence of the night. The sick man was growing weaker, but still he seemed likely to last some hours longer, and as he was then lying quiet and in less pain, I thought I would take the opportunity of going to my own room and getting some tea, which was always left in readiness for the nurse on night duty. My patient, however, could not be left unwatched, so I roused up the inmate of the next bed, a man whom I knew well, for he had been long in the hospital, and was in fact convalescent and expecting his discharge in a day or two. He was very good-natured and had often done little things of this kind for me before, so that I knew I could trust him. He was soon dressed and ready to take my place for ten minutes or so by the dying man.

"Don't hurry, Sister," he whispered, "I'll look after him, and, if anything's the matter I'll fetch you directly."

I nodded and went off to my room, not sorry to get a warm by the fire and a cup of hot tea.

TO BE CONTINUED.

A PROTESTANT MINISTER

Declares the So-Called Protestant Superiority in Ireland a Fraud.

Rev. Mr. Wark, a prominent minister of Memphis, Tenn., recently delivered a lecture on Ireland which is being widely published, owing to the truthfulness of the matter contained therein. The minister introduced his speech by remarking: "Long live old Ireland! Green be her fields, bright be her skies, and happiness be the portion of her sons and daughters." In his allusions to Catholic and Protestant Ireland, he said: "My business is to state facts not to make them. Of course I had ever been taught—in fact, I had read it in the Sunday school books—that the north of Ireland, which is supposed to be Protestant, is greatly superior to the south of Ireland, which is supposed to be Catholic. Now I have been through Ireland from the extreme south to the north, and I aver upon the honor of a gentleman and a Christian, that a greater fraud than the assumed superiority of the Protestant over the Catholic population of Ireland was never palmed off upon an innocent and unsuspecting public. It is pitiful when men attempt to coin religious capital out of such material. On the other hand, I saw more squalor, more abject misery, more poverty and wretchedness in Glasgow and Edinburgh than in the whole of Ireland put together. Scotland is Protestant, Ireland is Catholic. I say it is my duty to state facts as I see them, and not allow religious prejudice to blind my eyes to the truth. The sun of heaven shines on no fairer spot than the South of Ireland. From Malloy, on the Blackwater, to Cork, on the Lee, it was pure and beautiful as the dream in the heart of a senses maiden. I saw just two cities in Europe that I should care to live in. One of these is Dundee, in Scotland, the other, Cork, in Ireland—with a decided preference for Cork. Everywhere in Ireland I was treated like a gentleman. Never for an instant was I mistreated by a human being."

What do you take medicine for? Because you are sick and want to get well, of course. Then remember, Hood's Sarsaparilla Cures.

FIFTY YEARS AGO TO-DAY

The Celebrated Dr. Brownson Became a Catholic Convert.

Fifty years ago to-day, here in Boston, there was received into the fold and membership of the Catholic Church an individual who is considered even to the present day by many to have been the brainiest convert that ever entered its pale in this country from another religious denomination. The ceremony of his reception took place at the old cathedral in Franklin street, and his abjuration of his former errors and his profession of Catholicity were received by Right Rev. John B. Fitzpatrick, then about six months consecrated. Orestes A. Brownson, for such was the name of the convert in question, had just passed his forty-first birthday when he had the happiness of embracing the faith of which he became subsequently so stalwart an upholder. He was born September 16, 1803, at Stockbridge, Vt., both of his parents being native Americans, and the family, up to a short time before their distinguished son's birth, had been comparatively well-to-do, though his father lost nearly all of his property, about the beginning of the century, by business reverses. The elder Brownson did not long survive his financial misfortunes, and his death did not, of course, improve the condition of the family. In consequence of their straightened circumstances, Orestes, at the age of six, was confided to the care of some distant relatives, an aged couple, who kindly offered to relieve his mother of his support, and who did the best they could for him. Their best, however, was but little, and at the time when the ordinary child is found at school or play, young Brownson had to toil as well as he could on the farm whereupon his relatives had mainly to depend for a livelihood. He got very little schooling, in consequence; but he had an insatiable thirst for knowledge and managed to pick up a vast amount of information for one so young. He was an assiduous frequenter of the meeting houses,

WHERE HE SHOWED HIMSELF an attentive listener to the preachers who visited the place. He does not seem to have professed any particular creed though, and it was not until a number of years afterwards that mention is made of the fact that he joined the Presbyterians. At the age of fourteen he quit the roof that had sheltered his boyhood and went out into the world to make his own way in it. The next we hear of him he is studying at Ballston, N. Y., and supporting himself by his own hands, while prosecuting his studies, as best he could in his spare hours. His education, however, was gained in the most primitive of schools, a fact which he himself admitted some years afterwards, when, delivering an address before the students of Dartmouth College, he said: "The recollections and associations which make this a great day to you, a day long to be remembered and looked back upon as marking an important epoch of your life, form, I regret to say, no part of my experience. I have no recollections or associations connected with college or halls or academic bowers." The character of his mental training did not, though, prevent Dr. Brownson from becoming, largely through his own unaided efforts, one of the most accomplished of scholars and one of the more vigorous and profound thinkers and writers. The pages of his famous Review bear ample testimony to the breadth and depth of his learning; and he was proficient in many of the ancient languages and in other modern tongues than his own.

The Presbyterian creed which he adopted at the outset of his career soon proved wholly inadequate for such a religious mind as Dr. Brownson possessed, and he abandoned it for Universalist teachings. He even became in 1825, being then in his twenty-second year, a preacher of Universalism; but before long he recognized that he was still away from the truth, and for a while he wandered in the mazes of doubt and unbelief, and advocated various sorts of reform, political, moral and social. In 1832, after having read considerable of Dr. Channing's works, he drifted into Unitarianism, of which creed he became a minister; and, later on, he edited a publication which he called the Democratic Review. It is worthy to note that, after he had become a Catholic, he admitted that the nearer he came in his previous gropings after truth to the principles of sound philosophy, the closer he found himself to the Catholic Church. His actual conversion to Catholic truth took place, as already stated, here in Boston in October, 1844, when he took the final step in the old cathedral. "Seldom," says one of his eulogists, "is it given to a man to make as great a sacrifice as he did by that one act. He sacrificed the wealth he could have attained in the Protestant ministry, the highest honors which were within his grasp in politics, and the love of hundreds who, in like labors and pursuits, had been linked to him in the tenderest bonds of friendship." These things he counted as naught, however, with Dr. Brownson, who, throughout his whole career, never flinched from making any sacrifice that the cause of truth might demand from him.

His conversion effected, Dr. Brownson devoted his splendid abilities and wonderful energies to the championship of his new-found faith. At the request of the American hierarchy, he made his Review an organ of Catholicism, changing its name somewhat; and for the following twenty years its pages teemed with brilliant papers, exposing the errors and sophistries of Protestantism, and replying with res-

istless logic to the calumnies and misrepresentations that its enemies levelled against the Catholic Church. His virile mind grew stronger under Catholic influences, his insight into truth clearer, and even his style took on a new force. In alluding to the work he did in those days for the Catholic cause,

THAT OTHER GREAT CHAMPION of the faith, the still deeply-lamented Monsignor Corcoran, said: "He stood out certainly unsurpassed, perhaps unequalled, in his masterly handling of the mother tongue. But the beautiful workmanship is as nothing compared to the glorious material which it adorned. It is like the mantle of gold that enveloped the matchless Olympian love of Phidias," and a writer in the Catholic World declared, years ago, on the same subject, that "the terse logic of Tertullian, the polemic crash of St. Jerome, the sublime eloquence of Bossuet are all to be found in his writings in combination or alteration, with many sweet strains of tenderness and playful flashes of humor." In addition to his editorial work the doctor found time to write not a few volumes, the most noted of which are "The Convert; or, Leaves from My Experience," a work that has often been compared to Cardinal Newman's famous "Apologia"; "Liberalism and the Church," and "The American Republic," generally considered the best of all his books, which appeared in 1865.

Dr. Brownson's Review fell into disfavor, however, after it had upheld the Catholic cause for about twenty years, and complaints of the tone of its articles began to multiply. These complaints, some of which found their way to Rome, led to such a falling off of the magazine's patronage that it had to be abandoned in 1864 from lack of support. Its editor was too dogmatic in his manner to suit the times, and it must be acknowledged that in more than one instance he showed himself lacking in tact. His great abilities and profound learning were beyond question, however, and after the suspension of his Review his pen frequently pressed into service by other Catholic publications that were eager, as far as their limited means would allow, to secure his contributions. In 1875 the Review was again resumed.

PRINCIPALLY FOR THE PURPOSE of removing the suspicions that had attached to the doctor's loyalty to the Church; and in the introduction to the first volume of the new series, its editor said: "It was almost the last wish expressed to me by my late wife, whose judgment I never found at fault, that I should revive my Review, if only for a single year, and prove to the world that my faith has never wavered; that I am still an humble and devoted son of the Church; and that I am, as I always professed to be, an uncompromising Catholic." The resurrected Review was not destined to enjoy a long existence, though, as, in fact, could not be expected, considering the advanced age of its editor. It continued to make its quarterly appearances for the space of two years, and then it ceased; but not before the doctor had cleared away all the misgivings that had existed in his regard with certain individuals, and had effectively answered all the allegations that had been directed against him on the score of his faith. His vigorous defence of Catholic doctrines delighted his many admirers. His own position in resuming the publication of his quarterly was thus defined by himself: "I have no palinode to sing; I enter on no explanations of the causes of the opposition I encountered from some of my own brethren; such explanations would be mistimed and misplaced, and could edify nobody. I willingly admit that I made many mistakes; but I regard as the greatest of all the mistakes into which I fell during the last three or four years that I published the Review, that of holding back the stronger points of the Catholic faith, on which I had previously insisted; of laboring to present Catholicity in a form as little repulsive to my non-Catholic countrymen as possible; and of insisting on only the minimum of Catholicity, or what had been expressly defined by the Holy See or a general council." Continuing, he asserts that he is

NOT LIKELY TO FALL into that error again and disavows all desire to be taken for a liberal Catholic, adding that there was no element of liberal Catholicity in his nature or convictions.

Dr. Brownson's wife, to whom he was devotedly attached and to whose judgment he publicly paid the tribute of declaring that he never found it at fault, died at the family's place of residence, Elizabeth, N. J., in 1872. Some time subsequently the doctor went to live with his son, Henry L., at Detroit; and there the final summons came for him on April 17, 1876. He died, consequently, covered a period of nearly seventy-three years, and almost all of that space of time found him actively employed in some pursuit or another. For thirty-two of his years he was a member of the Catholic Church, whose obligations to him for the services he rendered it were many and manifold. His memory is still treasured by American Catholics, as his writings are prized by them, and more than one of our Catholic laymen have been named in his honor, as have several of our Catholic Reading Circles. His works have been republished in some twenty volumes, and these contain a wealth of information, much of which would be vainly sought elsewhere. These volumes bear the title "The Works of Orestes A. Brownson; Collected and Arranged by Henry

L. Brownson;" they were published at Detroit in 1883, and they bear evidence to the wonderful fertility of the doctor's mind, his wide, profound and varied knowledge and his marvellous mastery of the English language. Fifty years ago he embraced the faith he so valiantly upheld by his pen, and as his conversion occurred here in Boston, it seems but fitting that his memory should be recalled to the reader in this the month that saw his entrance into the Catholic fold.—Boston Republic, Oct. 20.

A Sharp Reply.

During the summer, at one of the German watering-places, the table d'hôte had just commenced. Amongst the assembled guests were seen two Catholic ecclesiastics, apparently secular priests, and said their grace. Several young fellows who were present began to laugh and make fun of the two priests in a very offensive manner. The priests quietly finished their grace and thereupon the elder of the two, tapping upon his glass to secure attention, turned to the company and addressed them in polite terms. "I am," he said, "a Catholic priest and Cardinal Prince-Archbishop of Vienna; my companion is Canon N. We were both taught by our mothers, as children to say grace before meals, and according to the precepts of our mother the Church, we are accustomed to sign ourselves at our prayers with the sign of the Cross. I observe, however, that this does not find favor with several of the distinguished company present. Should the majority of the guests agree that our grace and the sign of the Cross are unsuitable in our places at another table." Nearly all present protested loud and energetically against the conduct of the young men, and "Out with them!" was the unanimous verdict.

Life's Contrast as Seen in a Street Car.

There was hardly standing room the other morning when a N. Y. Herald reporter entered a Broadway cable car and clung to a strap in front of the only woman passenger. The conversation all related to money. The commercial columns of the morning papers were being glanced at among crowding elbows; from pockets protruding bundles of business looking documents and strips of green and yellow paper that told of the Stock Exchange.

All thoughts appeared to be on one subject; all minds occupied by a single idea—all but one. What a contrast!

The thoughts of the one woman were at the antipodes of those of her fellow-passengers. She was a Sister of Mercy. Her face was nearly covered by white bands and the usual dark, projecting bonnet.

Her indoor clothing was hidden by a long black cloak, whose edges were sufficiently apart for one to see her white hands as they rested in her lap. Her lips were gently and silently moving, as though her thoughts were on the border of words, and between her fingers was slowly passing a rosary. She was telling her beads.

WHAT DO YOU take medicine for? Because you want to get well, or keep well, of course. Remember Hood's Sarsaparilla Cures.

The superiority of Mother Graves' Worm Extremities is now by its good effects on the children. Purchase a bottle and give it a trial.

Minard's Liniment Cures Diphtheria. TESTIMONIALS published in behalf of Hood's Sarsaparilla are as reliable and worthy of confidence as if from your most trusted neighbor.

Corns cause intolerable pain. Holloway's Corn Cure removes the trouble. Try it, and see what an amount of pain it saves.

Minard's Liniment Cures Diphtheria.

To Make a Doughnut. Cottolene. the new vegetable shortening and you will be surprised at the delightful and healthful results. It is without unpleasant odor, unpleasant flavor or unpleasant results. With COTTOLENE in your kitchen, the COTTOLENE the delicate and the dyspeptic can all enjoy the regular family bill of fare. Cottolene is sold in 3 and 5 pound tins, by all grocers.

Hood's Cured After Others Failed

Scrofula in the Neck—Bunches All Gone Now.



Blanche Atwood, Bangorville, Maine. "C. I. Hood & Co., Lowell, Mass.: 'Gentlemen—I feel that I cannot say enough in favor of Hood's Sarsaparilla. For five years I have been troubled with scrofula in my neck and throat. Several kinds of medicines which I tried did not do me any good, and when I commenced to take Hood's Sarsaparilla, these were large bunches on my neck so sore that I could not bear the slightest touch. When I had taken one bottle of this medicine, the scrofula had gone, and before I had finished the second the bunches had entirely disappeared.' BLANCHE ATWOOD, Bangorville, Maine.

N. B. If you decide to take Hood's Sarsaparilla do not be induced to buy any other. Hood's Pills cure constipation by restoring the peristaltic action of the alimentary canal.

BEAUTIFUL SELECTIONS OF Rich Oil Chromos and Fine Oleographs.

Table listing various religious images and their prices, including Our Lady of Mt. Carmel, Holy Family, The Virgin, St. Teresa, Last Supper, St. Anthony Padua, Our Lady of Dolours, St. Ann, St. Joseph de Marillo, Sacred Heart of Mary, Sacred Heart of Jesus, Angel Guardian, Our Lady of Lourdes, Crucifixion, Madonna Immaculate, Ecce Homo, Our Lady of the Chair, and Death of St. Joseph.

A large and varied assortment of other subjects of different sizes. Stations and the Cross in all sizes and styles. Church Statues, in plaster or cement, plain or artistically decorated.

D. & J. SADLER & CO.

Catholic Publishers, Booksellers and Stationers, Church Ornaments, Vestments, Statuary and Religious Articles, 1669 Notre Dame St. MONTREAL. 115 CHURCH ST. TORONTO.

High-Class Church Windows

Hobbs Mfg. Co. London, Ont. ASK FOR DESIGNS

Pictorial Lives of the Saints

The Catholic Record for One Year For \$3.00.

The Pictorial Lives of the Saints contains Reflections for Every Day in the Year. The book is compiled from "Father's Lives" and other approved sources, to which are added Lives of the American saints, recently placed on the Calendar for the United States by special petition of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore; and also the Lives of the Saints canonized in 1861 by His Holiness Pope Leo XIII. Edited by John Gilmary Shea, LL.D. With a beautiful frontispiece of the Holy Family and nearly four hundred other illustrations. Elegantly bound in extra cloth. Greatly admired by our Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII., who gave his special blessing to the publishers; and approved by forty Archbishops and Bishops. The above work will be sent to any of our subscribers, and will also give them credit for a year's subscription on THE CATHOLIC RECORD, on receipt of Three Dollars. We will in all cases prepay carriage.

THE RITUAL OF THE P. P. A.

We have published in pamphlet form the entire Ritual of the company known as the P. P. A. The book was obtained from one of the organizers of the association. It ought to be widely distributed as it will be the means of preventing many of our well-meaning Protestant friends from falling into the trap set for them by designing knaves. The book will be sent to any address on receipt of 6 cents in stamps, by the dozen, 4 cents per copy; and by the hundred, 3 cents. A. W. THOMAS COFFEY, CATHOLIC RECORD, 115, London, Ontario.

COMMERCIAL HOTEL, 54 and 56 Jarvis Street, Toronto. This hotel has been refitted and furnished throughout. Home comforts, French style of cooking. MEAGHER & PEACOCK, Proprietors. D. R. WOODRUFF, No. 185 QUEEN'S AVE. W. Detective vision, impaired hearing, nasal catarrh and rheumatism treated. Spectacles and eye glasses adjusted. Hours, 12 to 6.

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS:
REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."
THOMAS COFFEY,
Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY,
MESSRS. LUKE KING, JOHN NIGH, F. J. NEVIN and W. A. SEVENS, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.
Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, a year measurement.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of Hamilton and Peterboro, 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. Arrears must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, Nov. 3, 1894.

FANTASTICAL HISTORY.

Some of our Protestant religious contemporaries have been printing of late an item informing their readers of the dates at which according to them those doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church against which part of the Protestant world objects became doctrinal teachings. Among the journals in Ontario which have published this piece of nonsense we notice the *Christian Guardian* of Toronto and the *Canadian Evangelist* of Hamilton.

The following is the style in which this list of "Roman innovations" is introduced by the "Christian Irishman" quoted in the *Canadian Evangelist* of the 15th inst.

"The Roman Catholic Church . . . claims to have been always the same, but history is against it. Once the Christian Church was pure, but the Romish branch drifted further away with each succeeding century from that original simplicity. Its successive steps in error and assumption were taken in the following order and at the following times:

"Invocation of the saints, 375 A. D.; the service in Latin, 600; Papal Supremacy, 606; images and relics, 787; Baptism of bells, 965; canonization of saints, 993; the celibacy of the priesthood, 1,000; transubstantiation, 1,000; sale of Indulgences, 1,095; use of beads in worship, 1,090; the sacrifice of the Mass, 1,100; the confession box, 1,215; restriction of the Bible, 1,546; purgatory, 1,439; worships of Mary, 1,563; seven sacraments, 1,547; creed of Pope Pius IV., 1564; Immaculate Conception, 1,854; Papal infallibility, 1,870."

This table of dates is not altogether a new affair. It has done service in the hands of Protestant polemicists during the whole of this century, and though it is made up of a lot of known falsehoods strung together, it will probably continue to be made use of for many years to come. It is worth while, once for all, to examine what its value is as a piece of history.

1. *Invocation of the Saints.* It is a doctrine of the Catholic Church that the prayers of saints are powerful before God to benefit us, and it follows that we may ask their prayers. Is this a new doctrine dating only from the year 375? The year 375 is after all very early in the history of Christianity. It is only half a century after the time of Constantine the Great, before which period there were ten general persecutions, to such an extent that only a very limited Christian literature has come down to us from the period of persecution. Nevertheless there is plenty of evidence to show that the compiler of the above table is a fraud of the first water, as the following extracts from inspired and other authentic history will show:

Jacob invokes his guardian angel to bless the sons of Joseph:

"The angel that delivereth me from all evil, bless these boys." (Gen. xlviii, 16; B. C. 1689.)

St. Michael the archangel prays for the people of Israel, and his prayer is heard:

"But at that time shall Michael rise up, the great prince who standeth for the children of thy people . . . and at that time shall thy people be saved, every one that shall be found written in the book." (Daniel xii, i B. C. 536.)

Jeremias, the prophet, when 468 years dead, and Onias, the high priest, also dead, prayed for Judas Maccabeus and his devoted army one hundred and fifty-seven years before Christ. (2 Mace. xv, 12, 16.)

St. John the Evangelist invokes the seven spirits that are before the throne of God:

"Grace be to you from him that is, and that was, and that is to come, and from the seven spirits which are before His throne." (Apoc. (Rev.) i, 4. A. D. 97.)

St. Irenaeus, who flourished in A. D. 170, says:

"The patriarchs and prophets of the Old Testament return thanks to God for our salvation: and Mary was the advocate or intercessor for Eve."

Hence it follows that Mary and the saints pray for us and we may invoke them.

Origen, who wrote A. D. 270, says

the "souls of those who were put to death for Christ . . . obtain remission of sins for those who pray." He also tells us that after death martyrs may do more for friends on earth than they can do in this life: "You will know better how to love them, and you will pray for them more wisely when you shall know that they are not merely your children, but your imitators." (Exhortation to a martyr.)

It would make this article too long if we were to attempt to refute in the present issue each of the statements made above. We shall therefore confine our remarks here to one other subject, and we chose that of images, said to have been first used in A. D. 787. We select this subject, because it is akin to that with which we have already dealt.

Is it true that images and relics were not used or honored or venerated in the Church of God before the year named? The following extracts will answer this question:

Under the Old Law God Himself commanded sacred images to be placed upon the tabernacle, and to enable this to be done according to His will, He filled Beseleel the workman "with the spirit of God, with wisdom, and understanding, and knowledge in all manner of work." (Ex. xxxi, 3.)

Beseleel, thus prepared for his work, made "two cherubims also of beaten gold, which he set on two sides of the propitiatory." (xxxvii, 7.) This was before Christ 1491.

Solomon also, when building the temple of God, B. C. 1012, made two cherubim each of ten cubits high which were set in the inner temple, and they were overlaid with gold; "And all the walls of the temple round about he carved with divers figures and carvings, and he made in them cherubim, and palm trees, and divers representations;" and the same was done on other parts of the temple. (3 Kings (P. Bible 1. Kings) vi.)

It is a well-known fact in ecclesiastical history that Leo the Isaurian, Emperor of the Eastern Empire, waged war against the use of sacred images in the churches. In the year 726, which was sixty-one years before the date given above, Leo issued an edict ordering their total abolition. They must therefore have been in general use long before this time. In fact Constantine Copronymus and Leo IV., the son and grandson of Leo the Isaurian, continued the war against images, and in 787, the date given by the papers we have mentioned for the first use of such images, a general council was held at Nice in which it was solemnly defined by the Bishops assembled from the whole world that sacred images are to be venerated. This was the answer of the Church to the iconoclastic innovators. Surely this would not have been decreed if it had not been the universal custom to venerate images long before this date.

Eusebius, the friend of Constantine the Great and the first Church historian, relates that in the churches erected by this emperor, one of which still exists in Rome, he placed silver images of Jesus, the Blessed Virgin, and other saints. This was about the year 325; and we know that in the Catacombs, which were used as cemeteries, and as places of refuge and worship by the Christians during the ages of persecution before Constantine, sacred images are found by thousands—images and pictures of Christ on the cross, or as an infant in the crib of Bethlehem, or in the arms of His blessed Mother, or as the good Shepherd; also the images of Mary, Sts. Peter and Paul and other saints without number. Symbolical images were also in common use, as the fish, in Greek *ichthus*, signifying Christ because the letters *i-ch-th-us* are the initials of the motto, *Jesus Christus Theou Uios Soter*; (Jesus Christ, the Son of God, Saviour.) Clement of Alexandria mentions this fact in his book of the lives of illustrious Christians of the second century, and strongly recommends the use of this symbolic image. To this we may add that to this day there exists in Rome, in ruins, the ancient palace of the Caesars, in which just over the principal stairway is to be seen a large and handsome fresco representing Christ crucified. This is a lasting testimony to the piety of the Emperor Constantine, who placed that image there in the early part of the fourth century.

We have said enough to show the usages of the primitive Church on the two points we have treated. It would require too much space to enter into details on this subject, but we reserve further remarks for a future issue of the CATHOLIC RECORD. It will be seen, however, from what we have

said, that the piece of history with which our religious contemporaries have thought proper to enlighten their readers and improve their historical knowledge, is a mere fancy sketch, without any foundation in fact.

WAWA!

This word, which will undoubtedly appear strange to our readers, is the title of a Polyglot newspaper which has reached us from Kamloops, British Columbia, through the publishing house of Messrs. D. & J. Sadlier; and quite an interesting curiosity we find this little journal to be. Wawa means speech in the Chinook tongue.

The number before us is printed in English, French and Chinook, the latter being the language spoken by the Indians of British Columbia. It reveals to us the interesting fact that the ingenious and zealous Fathers of the Oblate Order have actually introduced a system of shorthand as the written language of the Chinooks, so that this tribe is the first nation which has adopted a truly short method of writing, which is at the same time quite philosophical as the national means of representing spoken language.

By this system the Chinook tongue is spelled exactly as it is pronounced, and thus all the great difficulties of learning to read, which exist in most modern languages, and especially in English and French, are avoided; and the Chinooks, educated in this manner, are enabled to read and write their own language in an incredibly short time.

It is admitted by all scholars that the phonetic representation of any language removes the difficulties of learning to read and spell, and it is just this which the Oblates have taught the Chinooks to use; and not only are they able, when instructed by this method, to read and spell in a few days, but they are able in a short time to write as quickly as they think, and to keep pace with the fastest speakers!

The system of shorthand which has been thus introduced into the Indian schools, is the French system known as the Duployan. The editor of the *Wawa* asks:

"Why not adopt this system of shorthand for use in the English schools, as it is used extensively to great advantage throughout France and Lower Canada?"

As regards this we may venture an opinion that there are systems, or there is at least one system, of shorthand largely used by English reporters which may be better adapted for use in English; but this does not detract from the ingenuity and zeal which have induced the Oblate Fathers to introduce an excellent system of writing among a tribe adopting for the first time a written representation of their tongue.

The *Wawa* gives the full alphabet of the Chinooks, so that all who take an interest in the matter will be able to learn much on the subject of their tongue, by subscribing for the *Wawa*, which may be had from Messrs. D. & J. Sadlier & Co., Montreal.

THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH AND PRESBYTERIANISM.

The Presbytery of Muskingum, of the United Presbyterian Church, recently suspended a minister for teaching persistently that Saturday, not Sunday, is the true Sabbath. The case was appealed to the synod at Wheeling, West Virginia, and the suspension was sustained. The clergyman has now appealed to the General Assembly, and it is expected that this body will also sustain the suspension, as it is known to be sternly orthodox in its adherence to the Westminster Confession. The Presbyterian papers of the United States, with remarkable unanimity, approve of the suspension, the *Herald and Presbyter* of Cincinnati saying:

"It is hard to find words sufficiently condemnatory of such a man. The position of the United Presbyterian Church as to the Sabbath is so well known that any one seeking to agitate it on this line is a mere disturber of the peace."

Amid the diversity of opinions among the various sects on this as well as every other subject, it might seem out of place for us to express any opinion, but in matters of religious faith the whole public is deeply interested, and we do not consider it an undue interference to remark that the erring clergyman is by far more consistent than those who have condemned him.

We are assured by Presbyterians that it is a fundamental principle that nothing is to be accepted as of Christian faith which is not clearly laid down in Scripture. Now, Scripture certainly does not lay down clearly that the Sabbath has been changed

under the Christian law from Saturday to Sunday. It is certain that the original Sabbath appointed by Almighty God was Saturday, beginning at sunset on Friday evening, and ending at sunset on Saturday.

On what authority was the change made from the Jewish to the Christian day of rest? There is evidence to show that it was made in the days of the Apostles; and the authority of the Catholic Church is sufficient to authorize the belief that the change was made on sufficient grounds, the chief reason being that the principal mystery of Christianity, which is the basis of Christian faith, the resurrection of Christ, took place on Sunday; and secondary reasons being that the institution of the Church of Christ, and probably that the birth of Christ, took place on Sunday; but it is certain that there is nothing in the Bible to prove that the change was made by any competent authority—any authority which had the right to change what Almighty God appointed nearly six thousand years ago. It is only on the Catholic ground of Church authority and tradition that the change can be justified.

The Muskingum minister has all the authority of Scripture on his side; but he is condemned by Presbyterianism simply because he does not place the dictum of the Westminster Confession of Faith above the Bible, though that same Confession tells him that: "The decrees and determinations" of the Church, "if consonant to the word of God, are to be received with reverence and submission, not only for their agreement with the word, but also for the power whereby they are made, as being an ordinance of God, appointed thereunto in His word."

The fact is, the Westminster Confession requires its clergy both to set the Confession above the Bible, and the Bible above the Confession, at the same time. It is an act of gymnastics which many of the clergy are not able to perform to the satisfaction of the Presbyteries and General Assemblies; and this is the reason there have been, of late, so many heresy trials.

SIGNOR CRISPI AND THE CHURCH.

The speech delivered by Signor Crispi in Naples on the occasion of the inauguration of the King Humbert Memorial is still causing much discussion in the Italian papers.

It will be remembered that the Italian Premier called the attention of the people to the critical condition to which Italy had been brought by the monster anarchy, and that he declared that to combat this dreadful evil the cordial co-operation of Church and State is needed. He said:

"Society is passing through critical moments! We find it more than ever necessary that the two authorities, spiritual and temporal, should unite if they would lead back the misguided masses into the path of justice and love. A pernicious sect has come out from the darkest corners of the earth, and their device is: 'No God; no authority.' Let us unite to-day against this monster! Let our banner bear the inscription, 'With God and the king for our country.' Let us lift this banner on high and show it to the people as the sign of salvation: 'In hoc signo vinces.' (In this sign thou shalt conquer.)"

The speech was loudly applauded, as there can be little doubt it was interpreted by the Neapolitan people as being an olive branch held out to the Church, which has been persecuted by the Government ever since, and indeed since long before the Italian occupation of Rome.

It is undeniable that in spite of all the efforts of the Government to destroy religion in the hearts of the people, the latter are as a whole strongly attached to their faith and desirous to see the Church restored to its former position. That this is the case, especially in Naples, has been several times made manifest, and notably so in the twice repeated practically unanimous vote of the city in favor of the restoration of religious teaching in the Public schools, from which the Government had driven it out.

Crispi's effort to bring about a reconciliation has not, however, met with that cordiality which he seemed to expect even from the Government press. The *Riforma* of Rome said concerning it:

"The head of the Government thoroughly understands the situation, and his aim is to bring the clergy to a proper appreciation of their duties—duties which have newly arisen with the new times. If the facts should prove that it will not be possible to carry out his aims on account of the obstinacy of others then history will be able to determine who are the guilty parties."

This is a ridiculous attempt to throw upon the Church the whole blame of the hostile attitude existing between the Church and the State, but it is just what we might expect from the Masonic organ. It is equivalent to saying that the Church should quietly and contentedly submit to all the arbitrary methods of the Government, and should throw its influence into the scale in support of the Government's policy, whatever persecution she may be made to endure. Of course, the Church will not under any circumstances bolster up the cause of Anarchy, which she has always consistently denounced, but as the guardian of morals, she must equally denounce the spoliation to which she has been subjected, and the un-Christian policy which has excluded religion from the schools. It is this policy which has brought the Anarchists into existence, and the Government is reaping the consequences of its own suicidal course. The Catholic papers do not hesitate to remind Crispi of this, and the *Unita Cattolica*, the chief Catholic organ of Rome, recalls to mind the fact that in 1885 Signor Crispi said:

"There are only two courses open to us. We must break with the Vatican altogether, because we cannot make the people there our friends, or we must make concessions. For my part I am not inclined to make concessions."

Even now, while pretending to look for peace, where he has hitherto waged a relentless warfare, the Premier does not appear to be disposed to offer anything in return for the aid he asks for from religion. It is a one-sided peace which he demands, in which all the benefit is to be on the side of the Government; but if he is serious in wishing to repress anarchy, he must re-establish religious education which he has suppressed as far as he could, and, on the other hand, he must restore to the august head of the Church his independence, of which he has been deprived.

Even the very slight advance he made in his Neapolitan speech did not please his infidel followers, and in an interview with a newspaper reporter he shuffled very clumsily out of his Neapolitan declaration. He is said to have declared that he has no intention to enter into any negotiations with the Vatican, as he has always been of the opinion "that the State cannot make any concessions." He declared that he only wishes that the religious sentiment of the clergy and citizens will lead them, as having the interests of society at heart, to co-operate with the Government in putting down Anarchy.

The clergy will undoubtedly continue to do their duty by correct teaching in this respect; but neither the Pope nor the hierarchy nor the loyal Catholic population will agree to say that they are satisfied with the position of the Pope as a prisoner, or that he shall be a subject of the Italian Government. The only possible condition on which the Church can agree to condone the past persecutions she has endured is that the Pope's independence be fully restored, and his authority re-established in Rome itself, the historical centre of Catholic unity.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

SOME zealous Protestant ladies of Kansas City, Mo., succeeded recently by artifice in having a number of young girls discharged from the House of the Good Shepherd to which they had been committed for reformation. They were incited to this by the Kansas City A. P. A., and the girls have returned to the houses of ill-fame from which they had been rescued. The judge before whom some others of the same class had been brought rebuked the ladies (?) who had been so meddling, in this style: "You are not providing homes for these young females. Those whose release you have already secured have returned to dens of sin;" whereupon the ladies remarked: "We would prefer to have them in houses of prostitution than in charge of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd." This is the kind of morality which Anapism fosters.

The *New York Independent*, a leading Protestant religious paper, relates that in a Burmah native Christian congregation, bottles of Bass's pale ale were used for the Sacrament of the Lord's supper when wine could not be had. The ale had been presented for the purpose by an English officer, and the *Independent* expresses its conviction that if the occurrence happened, as reported, "it neither affects the Christianity of the converts, nor the sacredness of the rite." It admits also that it is "possible" that a Protestant Bishop in China "used tea instead of wine in the Sacrament of the Lord's

supper, in order to please the natives." This is known to have actually occurred; and we have known instances where a syrup, made by boiling dried grapes, was habitually employed when wine could easily have been procured. In some cases, also, water has been used by extreme prohibitionist churches, on the plea that it is sinful to use intoxicating wine. It is thus that these professing Christians consider themselves free to change the ordinances of Christ according to their whims. Nothing else could be expected when every man considers himself the supreme judge in matters of Christian doctrine. We have ourselves known of a clergyman who stated that he would be glad to use currant wine, instead of grape wine, because it was more easy to procure it: we presumed the meaning was that it would be less expensive.

THE Italian Government appears to be aiming at the total destruction of the usefulness of the Propaganda, the grand international institution whose object is the spread of the gospel in heathen lands. The Holy Father in a recent conversation expressed his deep regret at the steps taken to injure this great institution. Not only did the Government sell at a great sacrifice, some years ago, the landed property held by the Propaganda throughout Italy, but it taxed the interest which it paid to the Propaganda. This tax, which was 13 per cent. originally, has recently been raised to 20 per cent. Thus the tax amounts to about 115,000 francs annually, though the property thus taxed is the gift of Bishops and other friends of missions, belonging to all nations.

It is stated in a despatch from Rome that the Holy Father is about to issue a special appeal to the Anglican Church clergy on the subject of re-union with the Catholic Church. When it is considered that a very large and rapidly-increasing section of the Anglicans has returned to nearly all the doctrines of the Catholic Church, there is room for hope that the present appeal may bear fruit. On the subject of the Real Presence of Christ in the holy Eucharist, the Sacrifice of the Mass, its efficacy in relieving the souls of the faithful departed, on Purgatory, and the utility of prayers for the dead, on the reverence due to the saints of God, and the benefit to be derived from their intercession with God for us, and even in regard to the universal jurisdiction of the Pope, and many other doctrines, a very numerous and zealous body of the Anglican clergy are in accord with Catholics. It is true that on the last mentioned question they do not concede the complete authority which the Catholic Church claims to have been divinely given to the Holy See; but it does not seem that there should be any insuperable difficulty in the way of their agreeing with Catholics on this point. The same reasons found in the testimony of antiquity, which they have studied much during recent years, and which have led them to adopt other Catholic doctrines, should lead them equally to adopt this one fully. We may, therefore, reasonably hope that the conciliatory attitude of the Holy Father may be the means of bringing about a movement for union which cannot but be productive of great results.

Mission to Protestants.

The experiences of Father Elliot in his missions to non-Catholics, which have been read with such deep interest by all who have watched the progress of this new apostolate, go to show that the vast majority of Protestants in this country are still unconvinced by agnosticism. They are at least Christians in desire. Until in God's time our non-Catholic fellow-citizens are brought to the fulness of Christian knowledge, and made free with the freedom which is of God, let us beware of lessening in them, by word or example, anything that makes for true religion. It will be a sorry day for our Republic when Sunday ceases to be a day of strict observance, and the meeting-houses disappear from the country hillsides and the city streets. May they flourish until their attendants worship at altars whereon the great Sacrifice of Calvary is renewed! Few Catholics realize all that the little meeting-house is to Protestants, or how much acceptable service it may represent. The religious teaching of most Protestant preachers doubtless is harsh or cold or dry, and their words may seem like a winter's rain upon spring flowers; but there is one highly important lesson taught in the rudest of sectarian temples—the lesson of self-denial. May the influence of its harshness and severity, continue undiminished until it is changed into something higher and better!—Ave Maria.

We would fain see others perfect, and yet our own faults we amend not.—Thomas A. Kempis.

order to please the natives. known to have actually and we have known in a syrup, made by boiling grapes, was habitually drunk in wine could easily have been used by extreme prohibitionists, on the plea that it is an intoxicating wine. It is these professing Christians themselves free to change the of Christ according to their nothing else could be expected every man considers himself a judge in matters of doctrine. We have our own of a clergyman who he would be glad to use, instead of grape wine, was more easy to procure; and the meaning was that it is expensive.

an Government appears to at the total destruction of the Propaganda, the international institution whose spread of the gospel in Persia. The Holy Father in a conversation expressed his deep steps taken to injure this institution. Not only did he sell at a great sacrifice, ago, the landed property of the Propaganda throughout taxed the interest which it gave to the Propaganda. This tax, 13 per cent. originally, has been raised to 20 per cent. Six annual amounts to about 115,000 annually, though the property is the gift of Bishops and of missions, belonging to

ed in a despatch from Rome Holy Father is about to issue a deal to the Anglican Church the subject of re-union with the Church. When it is concluded at a very large and rapidly-section of the Anglicans has nearly all the doctrines of the Church, there is room for the present appeal may bear on the subject of the Beatification of Christ in the holy Eucharist of the Mass, its elevating the souls of the faithful, on Purgatory, and the prayers for the dead, and due to the saints of God, and to be derived from their with God for us, and even to the universal jurisdiction of the Pope, and many other a very numerous and of the Anglican clergy cord with Catholics. It is on the last mentioned question I do not concede the complete which the Catholic Church have been divinely given See; but it does not seem should be any insuperable the way of their agreeing policies on this point. The ones found in the testimony, which they have studied recent years, and which them to adopt other Catholic should lead them equally one fully. We may, therefore, hope that the conciliatory of the Holy Father may means of bringing about a union which cannot but be of great results.

vision to Protestants. experiences of Father Elliot in to non-Catholics, which read with such deep interest have watched the progress apostolate, go to show that majority of Protestants in this are still uncontaminated by a. They are at least Christian. Until in God's time Catholic fellow-citizens are the fulness of Christian and made free with the which is of God, let us beware in them, by word or example that makes for true It will be a sorry day for when Sunday ceases to be strict observance, and the sides disappear from the and the city streets. flourish until their attendance at altars whereon the office of Calvary is renewed! realize all that the Protesting house is to represent. The religious most Protestant preachers harsh or cold or dry, and may seem like a winter's spring flowers; but there is important lesson taught in that deep and enthusiastic pleasure we all experienced, when we first learned of your well-deserved promotion to your present high dignity by our revered and illustrious Chief Pastor, Pope Leo XIII. The honor so being conferred upon you, did and does redound to our honor also, for it is the grand and peculiar prerogative of our Holy Church that the vital and intimate union existing between her pastors and her people reciprocally redounds to the advantage and to the honor of each. That your grace, your noble qualities of both head and heart, adorn your holy and exalted dignity in the

ARCHDIOCESE OF KINGSTON.

Archbishop Cleary's Visit to Madoc.

North Hastings Review.

The Roman Catholic church in our town was the scene last Sunday morning of the intensely interesting and impressive ceremony of confirmation. Archbishop Cleary, now quite recovered from his late illness, was present, together with his private secretary, Rev. Father Kelly, the Rev. Father Farley, Vicar-General, and Rev. Father Davis. The service began at 10:30 with the celebration of the Mass by Rev. Father Davis, then immediately following, the rite of confirmation was administered by Archbishop Cleary. There were some seventy children, or more, confirmed. The girls looked very pretty in their white garments with wreaths of flowers and long floating tulle veils. On the conclusion of this ceremony A. A. McDonald, Esq., on behalf of the congregation, read an eloquent address to the Archbishop which was listened to with great interest by all, bearing as it did on important matters and events which had agitated our Province so recently. The Archbishop thanked the people in fitting and appropriate words for their kindness in presenting him with an address indicative of their kindly regard and appreciation of his services in their behalf as the defender and upholder of their rights and interests. He declared that he had only done his duty; that at a time when their civil and religious liberties were threatened it was necessary that one Bishop should stand forth and speak for all, that he would have been a coward to have shirked the duty which manifestly fell to his lot, and that at all times he would ever defend his people even at the risk of his own life. He then proceeded to give a clear exposition of the position and stand of the Roman Catholic Church, declaring that it never was the first to attack, that it was always on the defence, but that the point of attack was the point of defence and that when the attack ceased the Catholics would cease to defend. Continuing he remarked "that there was a time for peace and a time for war," and that he firmly believed that the time for peace had come. A recent public event had confirmed him in his prognostications of a long period of peace. He said in concluding his allusions to past strife that he might be a false prophet, but that he thought the word would now be sheathed for some generations. As we listened to his words we thought of Longfellow's beautiful vision of peace:—

"Down the dark furrows through long generations The echoing sounds grow fainter and then cease. And like a bell with solemn sweet vibrations I hear once more the voice of Christ say 'Peace.'"

Peace! and no longer from its prayer portals The blast of wars great organ shakes the skies. But beautiful as songs of the immortals, The holy melodies of love arise.

With reference to the petty persecutions of journalists to which the address had referred the Bishop said that he did not care, that they never troubled him in the least. He declared that he was no politician, that he never interfered with the regular course of legislation and had no desire to do so. As his forcible words fell on our ears and we marked the stern expression of his countenance indicating his powerful will and determined spirit we felt that in Archbishop Cleary the Roman Catholics of this province would ever find a staunch defender, and that whoever attacked him would find "a foeman worthy of his steel." Then the Archbishop addressed his remarks more particularly to the parents and the children. He exhorted the parents to train up their children for God, to watch carefully over the literature that came into their homes so that the children would not receive evil impressions. The children were instructed to remember that their first duty was to love God, then to love their neighbor as themselves. He spoke strongly on the necessity for them to do kindly acts and speak kindly words to their neighbors, no matter how they differed from them in religious opinion. They were admonished to remember their prayers, morning, noon and evening. He deplored the fact that they were obliged to go without religious instructions six days in the week, but that under the circumstances this could not be helped. The address was very long. It was about a quarter to two when the service was concluded, but it speaks well for the eloquence of His Grace that he retained the attention of his hearers until the end of his discourse. The choir deserve great praise for their rendering of the musical service. The music, as is usual in Catholic churches, was of a beautiful and elevated character and had the effect of intensifying the devotional feeling of the congregation.

Mrs. McDonell, of Trenton, presided at the organ, and during the service sang an "Ave Maria" and "O Salutaris" by Cherubini. The choir, under Miss O'Riordan, rendered some beautiful selections. The following is the address presented to the Archbishop: To His Grace most Reverend James Vincent Cleary, S. T. D., Archbishop of Kingston.

May it please Your Grace—We, your devoted, loyal children of the parish of Madoc, approach you to extend to you our warmest and most heartfelt greetings on this your second official visit to our parish as our Archbishop. We assure you it revives within us that deep and enthusiastic pleasure we all experienced, when we first learned of your well-deserved promotion to your present high dignity by our revered and illustrious Chief Pastor, Pope Leo XIII. The honor so being conferred upon you, did and does redound to our honor also, for it is the grand and peculiar prerogative of our Holy Church that the vital and intimate union existing between her pastors and her people reciprocally redounds to the advantage and to the honor of each. That your grace, your noble qualities of both head and heart, adorn your holy and exalted dignity in the

Hierarchy of our Province, is a fact well known to all the children of your archdiocese, and indeed also to our fellow citizens not of our faith.

For the Anglican Church: ESSENTIALS: CHRISTIAN UNION. ETC. For the CATHOLIC RECORD. Going back in the history of our times some forty or fifty years, we find that the two principal contending "schools of thought," in the English-speaking religious world—the Tractarian, or High Church school, on the one hand, and the Evangelical (so called), on the other—were, year after year, engaged in perpetual conflicts and controversies, bearing upon their respective tenets and theories, and especially upon the supposed authoritative teaching of the Church of England. In those days, the primary contention on both sides was ostensibly for "the faith once delivered to the saints," an Apostolic phrase, which at the present day seems to me to have fallen into almost entire disuse; the result, no doubt, of a continuously disintegrating basic principle, which, when not wholly resolving "faith" into "trust," reduces articles of faith to the level of changeable opinions, open to revision as a newer exegesis, an altered environment, or mere personal sentiment, may from time to time seem to suggest. But, as regards the Church controversies referred to, which were oftentimes of a rather acrimonious character, doubtless caused to involve questions which at that time (however otherwise it may be to-day) were held to be of the most vital importance, it must to many appear surprising that even half a century has not sufficed to bring about some definite pronouncements by the Anglican Church herself, in her corporate capacity, on matters of such significance. It may, however, it seems to me, be safe to say that this anomaly is sufficiently explained by the consideration that, as the Church of England, as a Church, had been for a long period practically mute, if not congenitally speechless—as the poet hath it: "Poor convocation gapes, alas! it cannot speak," and, moreover, though asserting her authority in matters of faith, never having pretended to such Divine assistance in her determinations as to warrant the homage or intelligent assent of her members; but, on the contrary, having virtually proclaimed her own incompetency as a teacher, the result must obviously have been a foregone conclusion with all parties concerned, that whatever her power in an administrative sense, her decisions could settle nothing as to the verities in question, and that, therefore, it was a matter of absolute necessity for each individual to content for his own construction and interpretation of what had been described by some Church adherents as her "ambiguous formularies;" formularies which, in some particulars, certainly, must be admitted to be neither definite, perspicuous nor even coherent; and in respect to which the two schools of thought referred to were, as a natural consequence, found to differ in no less a degree than in their deductions from Holy Scripture and the ancient fathers. As years rolled on, however, it would seem that the pretensions of both of these antagonistic parties were in great measure modified, the two sides gradually becoming reconciled to each other; relaxing their dogmatic tone; subsiding into a mutual toleration of their respective views; settling down to the idea of a broader comprehensiveness on the part of their Church; and finally attaining the apparent conviction that she had been manifestly devised by her founders to include, not simply one harmonious body of doctrine, but rather all shades of shifting opinion, compatible, at least, with a nominal acceptance of the ancient creeds. I say "nominal," because I suppose it must be very well understood that certain articles of the creeds are not by any means accepted in the same sense by all: the "one" Church, for example, being variously construed by different "schools of thought." And here permit me (although the purpose of this communication is not controversial, but merely suggestive) to observe in explanation of this remark that, while the Catholic contents that "one" Church means one, and hence excluding the idea of "severed" members, or "independent" branches ("Unity cannot be sundered,"—St. Cyprian), there is, on the other hand, a school which, to evade the force of Scriptural phraseology and analogies, claims that "the Church is a sacramental vine" developing runners which, taking root, "retain the common life, even when severed from the parent stock." Whether, however, the Scriptures can be reasonably construed to accord or not with this notion, I need not inquire, the more especially as it is obvious, in the case supposed, that "severance" means "separation" from the primary root and stock, rendering the severed portion no longer "one" with the original and persisting vine. With another school Church unity is supposed to consist in the invisible union with Christ of all Christian partakers of "the Sacrament." With some it becomes a unity of doctrines called essential. Then, again, I observe that Canon Wilberforce recently propounded his idea of unity to his Bishop by stating—if I correctly paraphrase his expression—that in the "divine nature" may be found the analogue of the unity exhibited in a heterogeneous sectarianism (the "Divine nature, be it here observed, being indivisible and immutable; a Tri-unity in whom

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH: ESSENTIALS: CHRISTIAN UNION. ETC.

For the CATHOLIC RECORD.

essence and understanding and wisdom and will are indistinguishable; and of whom it must be affirmed that the three persons equally concur, though in diverse respects, in every essential act or work. Finally, to omit a variety of other opinions, the ordinary High Church view would seem to be that "oneness" consists simply in Episcopal succession, or, more correctly, perhaps, simply in Episcopacy, a notion which excludes the possibility of the sin of schism. Evidently, therefore, it appears that, while accepting the creeds, there may still be question as to their sense objectively considered. But however this be, taking a general survey of schools and parties and views found to prevail at the present day, it can hardly be said to be strange to witness "high" and "low" and "broad" and "no" Church adherents acquiescing in a common policy of concession; erecting compromise into a sort of principle, and finally adopting the opinion of the late Bishop Wilberforce, that "extreme divergencies of doctrine" are "inevitable" in the Church of England; or, as the worthy Thomas Hughes, of Oxford, put it to the House of Commons, "that the Church of England contains everything from Romanist to Rationalist in precisely the same degree as the state of things, it can surely be no cause for astonishment to find a clergyman of the National Church (since exalted, if I mistake not, to the Episcopal dignity) not long ago delivering himself as follows: "Between (Mr. Maurice and Dr. Pusey), it may be said with almost literal truth, that it was hopeless "to find any common measure. The two men had two wholly different religions, to which each gave the name of Christian. Both spoke of sacrifice, atonement, redemption, melioration, salvation; and both attached to these, and to almost every other term of their theology, conceptions, hopelessly antagonistic. Both had their recognized status in the Church of England, and both, beyond doubt, had an equal right to it." The writer in question then proceeds to maintain the opinion that the Church should embrace "all who profess and call themselves Christians."—(Rev. G. W. Cox, in *Contemporary Review*, June, 1855.) And here I am reminded of the saying of Coquerel, the once famous Protestant minister of Paris: "La diversité des sectes qui partagent le Protestantisme, forme son plus beau titre de gloire;" a view of things somewhat analogous to that subsequently maintained by the late Rev. Henry Ward Beecher (that brilliant but wandering star, whom no centripetal force of Church or Bible could retain in definable orbit), and which in another form seems to have found previous expression in one of the phases of the idealistic philosophy: "Truth as humanity knows it is not what the schoolmen call it, one and indivisible; it is like light, and splits not only into elementary colors, but into numberless tints."—(Caxtoniana ii., 70.) But, how great a departure we have in the view of Rev. Mr. Cox from the belief and opinions of many High-Churchmen I need not attempt to show. Time was, indeed, when, so far from admitting all who say Lord, Lord, to be of the household of faith, English churchmen would never for a moment have thought of looking abroad among what in English phrase are called "dissenters," with the object of effecting a merely nominal union, or even harmonious joint action; their fraternal regards being directed exclusively towards those communions in which the Episcopal order had been preserved; and their highest ambition, seemingly, the attainment of some recognition of Anglican orders or priesthood by Greek Patriarch or prelate. Years upon years spent in that effort, in vain, would appear now, however, to have cooled their ardor in that direction, diverting it into more congenial channels, so that at the present day it has become to many a matter of surprise, on the one hand, and of thankfulness, on the other, to observe on occasions the facility with which the "higher" churchman can lay down his apostolic arms and play fast and loose with outlying dissenters, by whom, in some instances, at least, the nod of recognition, from so unexpected a quarter, seems to be regarded as an augury of a more complete surrender of Episcopacy at no distant day. And now, once more, we hear on all sides words of peace following thoughts of Christian union, which again, like the flowing of the tides, are resuming their periodical sway, and energizing the different communities with the feeling, apparently, that, if the isolation of each be not a reproach to all, it is without question a standing stumbling block to unbelievers. And, accordingly, failing, to all appearance, in the courage of their convictions, or unwilling to accept boldly the inevitable results of the cardinal and generative principle of the reformers, we find now the issue to be what it is; the one idea of the ministerial brethren on the union question being, when analysed, reducible, it seems to me, to the problem of how to minimize the revealed Word of God in a manner to effect a sort of compromise or understanding as to essentials, so that by agreeing to differ on what may be considered to be minor points, homage may be rendered to the respective views of each communion, wherein they differ, and thus the world at large be impressed by an imposing, though questionable or artificial, unanimity of thought and feeling. Do I exaggerate the character and import of the problem? I think not; but, as bearing upon it, let me be permitted to recall circumstances of fifty years ago,

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH: ESSENTIALS: CHRISTIAN UNION. ETC.

For the CATHOLIC RECORD.

when the Presbyterian Church of the United States, having offered a premium for the best essay on the dissensions of the Churches, awarded the prize, out of twenty-seven competitors, to the Rev. Paracelsus Church; from whom I quote as follows: "If we mean by essential Christianity not only that portion of inspired truth which is necessary to the conversion of a sinner, but also to perfect the work of his sanctification, then we see not how we could exclude any part of that inspiration. Is it not all essential to the perfecting of the saints, and the edifying of the Body of Christ? Dare we omit anything which God has not omitted? If one idea of essential or substantial, therefore, as applied to God's truth, comes anything short of the whole revealed subject matter, it will have the effect to increase rather than diminish the obstacles to union among Christians, and at the same time will impose the hazardous task of determining what portion of that which God has affixed His own infallible impress we must retain and what portion we may sacrifice. . . . Because one inspired truth is less important than another, is it therefore unessential?" (Page 43, *et seq.*) Although these remarks are half a century old, it seems to me they are as applicable to-day, in spite of the softening of asperities and removal of kindred barriers to harmony. Notwithstanding, therefore, all the recent hints and projects for the accomplishment of Christian union, and giving full weight to the interchange of courtesies and compliments among those feeling interested in the movement—which, by the way, to broad-clericals, like Mr. Heber Newton, seem to be suggestive of the grotesque, so far forth as high-churchism is concerned—we may, perhaps, be not incorrect in assuming that, whatever the disposition of the Churches in general, there are still likely to be found large numbers of our Episcopal brethren who will continue to hold aloof from fraternizing *in sacris* with outside bodies or with "unordained" clergy, and who will insist, with Bishop Dudley, of Kentucky, when arguing for "Bishops, priests and deacons," that their Church "speaks with no uncertain voice as to the necessity for an authorized, an apostolic ministry." (*North American Review*, November and December, 1886.) True, indeed, per contra, the question may be suggested as to the meaning of this supposed "necessity." Has it, not, for instance, been generally held, from Barlow, Hooker, Bramhall and Andrews downwards, that the "exigence" of circumstances dispenses with the "necessity" of Bishops, as in the recognized reformed Churches of the continent? Who is to decide as to the fact of exigency? Does not the dispensing necessity completely overthrow the doctrine of succession? Is it not an entire surrender of the position to Presbyterianism, with the reservation merely of Bishops as a sort of ecclesiastical orderlies, rather than the ministers of orders? Is the dispensing necessity a power? I can understand the exigence of necessity wholly relieving individual souls from any obligation in respect to Church rites and ordinances, but this, it appears to me, is a very different thing from making "necessity" do Episcopal duty, and, as a kind of functional, convey ministerial authority. Supposing, however, all these points satisfactorily answered, I am still led to remark further upon the position taken by Bishop Dudley, where he says: "Whatever be the opinion of the individual minister, preach he Romanism or Calvinism, when he stands by the font he can only say, 'Dost thou believe all the articles of the Christian faith as contained in the Apostles' Creed?' . . . the one Creed to be confessed by all, and liberty of opinion as to all else." . . . These I find to be the characteristics of the Protestant Episcopal Church as to her teaching." (*North American Review*, Nov. and Dec., 1886.) Strange position, truly: "The Apostles' Creed, and liberty of opinion as to all else!" Yet, though the Creed mentions Pontius Pilate, which seems somewhat like a redundancy, there is nothing in it about Baptism, or Bible, or *semper ubique omnibus*, or Holy Eucharist, or even about Bishops. How is this? How reconcile the assertion of the necessity of Bishops, with the "liberty" of the assertors to deny both the necessity and institution of Bishops? Waiving this point, however, it is true Baptism is mentioned in the Nicene formula, and perhaps even Bishops may be supposed to be implied in the "Apostolic" Church, though obviously this is a point which may very well be questioned, and which at all events requires proof the Creeds themselves do not furnish. But why not allow "liberty of opinion" as to the Creeds also? The three Creeds, if I rightly understand the matter, are accepted by the Episcopal Churches, not as independent testimonies or authorities; not because they have come down to us from early times, and embody some of the principal points in the teaching of the early Church; but simply and solely because "they may be proved" from "Holy Scripture." And the ultimate authority or standard as to what may be proved from Holy Scripture is virtually declared to be, not the Church, not the Bishops, not even "*quod semper ubique*," etc., but each and every individual soul; a principle which differs essentially in no way or manner from that of the Protestant Churches in general. Why not, therefore, liberty of opinion as to the Creeds? The answer, to my mind, seems obvious, that

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH: ESSENTIALS: CHRISTIAN UNION. ETC.

For the CATHOLIC RECORD.

the various Churches are assumed to be Divine institutions, in any real and practical sense of the term; Churches of God, not merely Churches of men; and if, at the same time, the impetus of private judgment, with its implications, is likewise considered to be divinely authorized; the erection of any creed barrier to Church membership or union must of necessity be not merely incongruous, but entirely unwarranted. And this is the view which seems to me to be implied in the remark of the Rev. Mr. Cox, when he says, in equivalent terms, that all who profess and call themselves Christians and pay their pew rent? have done all that any Church has the right to ask or demand. On the other hand, however, if in contradistinction to the view which holds the Church, in its most essential external features, to have been permanently organized by Christ Himself, it should be found that the several Churches in question are self-created, or segregated, and self-organized communities, local, territorial or national—terms to which the note of Catholicity stands in direct contrast and opposition—then, indeed, it seems to me that such Churches or congregations may with perfect consistency adopt conditions of communion or union, broad or narrow, rigid or flexible, to suit their respective views and purposes, just as any other humanly devised association, depending upon conventional understanding or the accordances of its adherents, is consistently free to do. The precise value, however, of such combinations, in a theological point of view, is a very different question. But, having already trespassed too far on your indulgence, permit me to close with a digressive remark, suggested by this word "congregation." We know that in the early English Protestant Bibles the word in question was substituted for that of "Church;" as, for example, "on this rock I will build My congregation." Have we here a "view" reproduced from some primitive "school of thought," or is the word merely to be looked upon as indicative of the anomalous position of Anglican Christianity at that period? Whatever the explanation may be, it is certain, at all events, that the old translation was in process of time restored, together with the "Church principles" which gradually revived, though, as Macaulay informs us, it was not until A. D. 1661 that "Episcopal ordination was for the first time made an indispensable qualification for Church preferment." (Hist. of Eng., chap. 2.) Yet, even at the present day, it is not unusual to meet with "churchmen" who, to all appearance, would willingly expunge "Church" from Holy Writ, if in their power to do so; who talk of Church and sacraments with ill concealed indifference; though at the same time showing very little disposition to undervalue their own individual persons and the sounds of their own voices as instrumentalities in the economy of grace.

Thanking you for your courtesy, I am yours,

Ontario, 1894. NEMO.

"A DUKE'S BROTHER."

Toronto, Oct. 26, 1894.

Ed. CATHOLIC RECORD, London:

Dear Sir—As a constant reader of the Record I may perhaps be pardoned for calling attention to your publication of the story of a correspondent of the *Church Progress* writing from Louisville, Ky., and headed "A Duke's Brother."

It is, I think, important in the highest degree that stories of this sort should be well sifted as to their truth before they gain admission, even by way of extracts from other journals, to a paper like the RECORD. The name of Beaufort at once caught my eye as a Gloucestershire man, and one born, so to speak, upon the Duke of Beaufort's estates. For your information then I may say, and you may verify my statements by reference to "Burke's Peerage," that the present Duke of Beaufort has no brother, and never had one—that the family name is Somerset, and that only the head of the family and his lady—or a Dowager Duchess or the Duchesses—can bear the name of Beaufort. There certainly therefore is no living relative of the family who has any right to call himself by the name of "Darnley Beaufort." Here again I would refer you to the Peerage, where you will find no one of that name through all the Lords Somerset, from the Marquis of Worcester (the eldest son of the Ducal house) downwards; as well might you call sons, younger sons and daughters of the Ducal house of Norfolk by the name of "Norfolk." We all know that they are "Howards."

To come down—it is not true that the Duke of Beaufort was involved in the scandal to which the correspondent of the *Church Progress* refers. Not a hint of the kind was ever levelled at His Grace.

I pass over the other noble names mentioned in this connection by the correspondent as "pretentious and silly." They are wicked, however, because untrue. Silliness, untruth and wickedness often proceed from the haters of the British nobility who abound on the other side. The chief seat of the Duke of Beaufort is at Badwinton in Gloucestershire in the South-west of England. The correspondent has transplanted it to the north.

The whole production, to one who knows anything of the noble ancient family of the Somersets, is suggestive of suspicion; and we may depend on it there is a "nigger in the fence somewhere." Yours faithfully

A LOVER OF TRUTH.

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH: ESSENTIALS: CHRISTIAN UNION. ETC.

For the CATHOLIC RECORD.

The Right Rev. Mgr. Brown, president of Maynooth College, has been appointed Bishop of Cloyne, and the Rev. Dr. Owens, professor in the same college, Bishop of Clogher.

The numerous, spacious and elegant churches, schools and convents that have been erected throughout the diocese under the direction and supervision of His Grace, since he took command after he has passed his reward, and served his mission as Archbishop, are everywhere displayed by him in having suitable churches erected for the honor and glory of God and the uplifting of our Holy Religion.

When the lives of the great men who have been connected with the Church in Canada will be written, the name of your present and saintly Archbishop will shine out prominently and rank among her greatest prelates.

The Right Rev. Mgr. Brown, president of Maynooth College, has been appointed Bishop of Cloyne, and the Rev. Dr. Owens, professor in the same college, Bishop of Clogher.

The numerous, spacious and elegant churches, schools and convents that have been erected throughout the diocese under the direction and supervision of His Grace, since he took command after he has passed his reward, and served his mission as Archbishop, are everywhere displayed by him in having suitable churches erected for the honor and glory of God and the uplifting of our Holy Religion.

When the lives of the great men who have been connected with the Church in Canada will be written, the name of your present and saintly Archbishop will shine out prominently and rank among her greatest prelates.

The Right Rev. Mgr. Brown, president of Maynooth College, has been appointed Bishop of Cloyne, and the Rev. Dr. Owens, professor in the same college, Bishop of Clogher.

The numerous, spacious and elegant churches, schools and convents that have been erected throughout the diocese under the direction and supervision of His Grace, since he took command after he has passed his reward, and served his mission as Archbishop, are everywhere displayed by him in having suitable churches erected for the honor and glory of God and the uplifting of our Holy Religion.

When the lives of the great men who have been connected with the Church in Canada will be written, the name of your present and saintly Archbishop will shine out prominently and rank among her greatest prelates.

LORD RUSSELL'S CHILDHOOD HOME.

How the Life of the Lord Chief Justice of England Began.

Katharine Tynan Hinkson contributes to a recent issue of the Arc Maria a fascinating sketch of Lord Russell, of Killowen, the first Catholic Lord Chief Justice of England, since England's break from the Church in the sixteenth century. We quote:—

The house where the great lawyer first saw the light was a tall, old grey house at Ballybot, a suburb of Newry, near which was his father's brewery. Arthur and Margaret Russell were parents of five children, two boys and three girls. The father, long an invalid, was a man of most sweet and indulgent character; the mother, with her strong, noble, energetic nature, had the greatest possible influence over the character of her children. In that truly Christian household all the virtues were taught, and most especially the virtue of charity. Indeed, "the charity of Christ urgeth us" might have been written on those nursery walls; for, of the five children who played therein, four dedicated themselves to the service of God in religion, while the first lived to be so great an honor to the Church of which he is a devoted son as Lord Russell, of Killowen.

Of that family life one now and again catches a glimpse in the poems of the well-known Dublin Jesuit, who is Lord Russell's brother: as for instance:

"The harsh word 'beggar' was under ban in that quaint old house by the sea; And little blue Frook's announcements ran: 'Tis a poor little girl—a poor blind man— Poor woman with children three."

And again, when he counts God's benefits, we hear of:

"Chiefest as first, the truest, best of mothers, Whose kind, firm prudence never since hath slept;

"And those fair angels, saintly, wise, light-hearted, Whose smile made pure the very air I breathed.

"And who at parting (for we all have parted) Sweet sanctifying memories bequeathed."

The "quaint old house by the sea" was Seafield, Killowen, where the family removed while Charles was still a little boy. In this enchanting place, between the mountains and the sea, the children found a paradise. They were free, and even encouraged, to make friends with the peasant folk about them; and they knew every old Tom and Biddy of the district, were familiar with all their aches and pains, and were welcome guests at the cottage hearths. Killowen village nestles delightfully under the lee of a mountain; Carlingford Bay faces it, and the children knew all the delights of mountain and sea. They are not forgotten there. The peasants yet remember the charity of the mother, and are proud of the distinguished son. He does not forget Killowen, any more than his Jesuit brother, who, hearing a cock crow in France, is reminded of the chancicleer

"That flaps his wings and crows, perchance, this hour Before George Kilty's door in dear Killowen."

but has often revisited the beloved home of his boyhood.

A little discursiveness about those dear brothers and sisters may be pardoned. Father Mathew Russell is, to a section of young Irish writers, a far greater man than his brother. He edits the Irish Monthly, a little green-covered periodical which has weathered the storm and stress that especially beset Irish periodical literature for well over a score of years. How many pretentious periodicals it has seen born and die? The Irish Monthly is the nursery of young poets. Nothing there goes by fear or favor; and the timidest neophyte may send the most blurred manuscript, confident that if there be in it the tiniest seed of poetry, it will be recognized by those kind editorial eyes.

Father Russell's friendship, once won, is never-failing. He is extraordinarily like his distinguished brother, and yet extraordinarily unlike. Lord Russell has a square, massive face, of deep-set eyes that mentally dissect you as they gaze. Father Russell is a little rosy man, with a round face that wears an expression of absolutely tender benignancy. As he bustles into the big bare parlor of the Jesuits to receive you, his very "Good morning!" has a kindness in it impossible to describe; and the very sight of his face disarms the Protestant to whom "Jesuitical" has long been an adjective of boding. Yet there is the inexplicable family likeness which would make recognize you the one from the other all the world over.

Father Russell's devotion to literature is only less than his devotion to his priestly office. His kindness to his literary circle shines on the just and the unjust. People of all religions and no religion ask for Father Russell at Gardiner street, and it may safely be said that none go away unbenefited. There is scarcely a writer of note who has come out of Ireland in the last twenty years, irrespective of creeds and politics, that has not contributed to the Irish Monthly; and it is surprising to find by how many Protestant households, even of the narrow Low Church which prevails in Ireland, Father Russell's name is loved and honored.

To his sisters, the nuns, Father Russell refers in a verse quoted earlier. There is another verse, even more tender, which must refer to one of them:

"Oh, for her earnest faith who said to me, a heedless boy, When some long 'vile' that we paid Would my dull faith annoy: Now wait and say another prayer (How swift the time has flown!) 'Till some one comes, I can not bear To leave Him all alone."

The three sisters entered the Order

of Mercy. Of these the eldest, who became a nun at eighteen years of age, volunteered a little later to go out to San Francisco to found a conventual hospital. That was in 1854, and since then the work of her hands has so marvellously increased and flourished that she is now something of a power in the State.

The other two remained in the Newry Convent of Mercy, where one, Sister M. Aquin, died in 1876. The other still survives. I should like to quote a description of Sister Aquin, taken from "Hester's History," a very early novel by Miss Rosa Mulholland, who was devoted to the gentle nun:—

"Here were sweet, tender, pitiful blue eyes, and a brow smooth and serene under its spotless little band; no latent fire, no lines to show where frowns had been. The face was oval and softly moulded, and very winning in its exquisite freshness and purity. The mouth was noble, and though ever quick with the right word, was, in its changing expressions, most eloquent of much that is left unspoken. The complexion was so dazzling fair, so daintily warmed with its vermilion on the cheeks, no paint or powder could mimic it; only early rising, tender labors, never ceasing and perpetual joy of spirit, could be combined in producing it. The quaint black garment, the long floating veil and narrow gown of serge were right fit and becoming to the wearer. They laid hold of her grace and made their own of it; while she, thinking to disguise herself in their sombre setting, wrapped the unlovely folds around her, and shone out of them as only the true gem can shine. The shadow that the black veil threw around her face made its purity almost awful, but its bloom and simplicity more entirely enchanting."

The future Lord Chief Justice was named after his father's young brother, then student at Maynooth, but afterwards, from 1857 until his death in 1880, the president of that cradle of the Irish priesthood. Dr. Russell was a great and distinguished scholar and writer, a man of the world after the manner of Cardinal Manning or Francis de Sales, a saint who had for his exemplar "the first true gentleman that ever breathed," as an old poet quaintly and reverently described Our Lord. He was Newman's friend, the one who helped him most of all. As the "Apologia" says: "He was gentle, kind, unobtrusive, uncontentious. He let me alone." So it would seem it was Dr. Russell's personality more than his arguments that helped the great Cardinal.

After those halcyon, boyish days by the sea, and on Killowen Point that stretches like an arm of grey shingle into the sea, Charles Russell went to school to a Mr. Nolan in Newry. Later he spent some time at St. Malachy's, Belfast, and at Castleknock, near Dublin. Still later he put his name on the books of Trinity College, Dublin, and himself under the tutorial care of his townsman, Dr. Ingram, who wrote the finest of Irish revolutionary songs, "Who Fears to Speak of '98?" But at this time he was already practising as a solicitor in Belfast, and he never took out his degree. He was a mere boy when apprenticed to Hamill & Denver, a Newry firm of solicitors.

Cardinal Vaughan characterized this method of procedure as a spiritual brigandage and wholesale sacrilege. To call themselves members of the Catholic Church and forcibly enter into a name which means for both two essentially distinct creeds is condemnable by all honest minds and can never lead to union. They are wolves in sheep's clothing who steal into the fold.

But on the other hand there are many earnest and prayerful souls who desire to be united to the true Church by the observance of the precepts and the profession of faith. They should not only command our sympathy, but our prayers and advice. Many are kept back only by domestic ties and by fear of losing that position by which alone they can gain a livelihood. The Holy Father is touched by the earnestness of many who are anxious to return to the Church, but who are deterred for this and many other similar reasons. Quite recently, in his "Encyclical to the Rulers and People of the World," the Holy Father has made a new appeal to the consciences of our separated brethren.

"Let us, one and all," he says, "for the sake of the common weal, labor assiduously to restore the ancient concord and union. To bring about this concord and to spread abroad the benefits of Christian revelation the present is the most reasonable time, for never before have the sentiments of human brotherhood penetrated so deeply into the souls of men, and never in any age has man been seen to seek out his fellow-countrymen more eagerly, in order to better both to know and help them."

Why should not our present century, which is hastening to its close, bequeath to mankind pledges of concord and the prospect of those great benefits which are dependent upon the unity of Christian faith?

The Church makes no compromise with error. She cannot accept a reunion on the basis of a common formula of belief which each one is allowed to interpret the formula as he pleases. There must be unity in the interpretation as well as in its outward expression. Moreover, the Church cannot accept reunion on the basis of simply believing in Christ; it must be based upon Christ as a living teacher and embrace everything which He has taught. All truths explicitly proclaimed or implicitly contained in Christ's teaching must constitute by necessity the material object of faith. If these conditions are not verified, if this basis is not accepted, then there can be no union, nor can the Church accept reunion if she be obliged to change in the slightest degree her constitution. This is divine, fixed by Her Founder and incapable of being modified or changed by man. These are truths which are immutable. But when there is simply discipline in

question, when it is merely a matter of legislation, the Church for a greater good may admit changes and modifications. Here we will use the Cardinal's own words:

"The invisible rock is Christ, the visible rock Peter, constituted in one solidity with Christ. These are truths which are immutable and no man can change them. But the Church is free for the sake of some greater good to admit changes and modifications in her discipline and in legislation which concerns times and circumstances. She has power over her own commandments and over questions of discipline, such as clerical celibacy, communion under both kinds, over her liturgy and the language in which the liturgy is clothed. Nor would she hesitate again to make concessions, as she did in times past, for the sake of some great good, could they be shown to surpass in value adherence to the points of discipline to be relaxed. Let so much suffice upon the general principle of concession or compromise."

Thus in the matter of compromise there can be none if it affects the truths of faith or the divine constitution of the Church. The Church, however (and the Cardinal speaks for England) will show herself condescending in things which she can change for the benefit of the Anglican clergy, provided she considers it to be for the spiritual benefit of their souls, and consequently for a greater good.—Philadelphia Catholic Times.

There are some who in this movement are not led by proper motives and who seek union with other Christian Churches by a compromise of truth, by methods which are not based upon unity of dogma. This is the essential condition of true union, and all else must necessarily fail as being fictitious and as a covering for error. Such would be the union suggested by an Anglican appeal couched in these words:

"One effectual way of displaying the credentials of the Church of England to the world, and asserting the rights which those credentials bestow upon her, is for the thousands of Anglican Catholics who visit countries owing allegiance to the Pope to go as members of the Catholic Church for holy Communion to the churches of the land in which they are sojourning. Such an open and collective movement would do more for the Anglican communion abroad than building chapels has accomplished. Our duty is plain, the issues are with God."

Cardinal Vaughan characterized this method of procedure as a spiritual brigandage and wholesale sacrilege. To call themselves members of the Catholic Church and forcibly enter into a name which means for both two essentially distinct creeds is condemnable by all honest minds and can never lead to union. They are wolves in sheep's clothing who steal into the fold.

But on the other hand there are many earnest and prayerful souls who desire to be united to the true Church by the observance of the precepts and the profession of faith. They should not only command our sympathy, but our prayers and advice. Many are kept back only by domestic ties and by fear of losing that position by which alone they can gain a livelihood. The Holy Father is touched by the earnestness of many who are anxious to return to the Church, but who are deterred for this and many other similar reasons. Quite recently, in his "Encyclical to the Rulers and People of the World," the Holy Father has made a new appeal to the consciences of our separated brethren.

"Let us, one and all," he says, "for the sake of the common weal, labor assiduously to restore the ancient concord and union. To bring about this concord and to spread abroad the benefits of Christian revelation the present is the most reasonable time, for never before have the sentiments of human brotherhood penetrated so deeply into the souls of men, and never in any age has man been seen to seek out his fellow-countrymen more eagerly, in order to better both to know and help them."

Why should not our present century, which is hastening to its close, bequeath to mankind pledges of concord and the prospect of those great benefits which are dependent upon the unity of Christian faith?

The Church makes no compromise with error. She cannot accept a reunion on the basis of a common formula of belief which each one is allowed to interpret the formula as he pleases. There must be unity in the interpretation as well as in its outward expression. Moreover, the Church cannot accept reunion on the basis of simply believing in Christ; it must be based upon Christ as a living teacher and embrace everything which He has taught. All truths explicitly proclaimed or implicitly contained in Christ's teaching must constitute by necessity the material object of faith. If these conditions are not verified, if this basis is not accepted, then there can be no union, nor can the Church accept reunion if she be obliged to change in the slightest degree her constitution. This is divine, fixed by Her Founder and incapable of being modified or changed by man. These are truths which are immutable. But when there is simply discipline in

CARDINAL VAUGHAN ON THE RE-UNION OF CHRISTENDOM.

The Catholic Truth Society recently held its annual conference in Preston, the main feature being the significant and eloquent address of Cardinal Vaughan upon the subject of England's return to the Catholic faith.

An English Church Congress opened at Exeter a few days since. The Bishop of that See presided and urged upon the Anglican Church a catholicity of spirit towards other denominations.

Again, we read in the latest despatches from Rome that the Pope is preparing a special appeal to the clergy of the Anglican Church on the subject of the reunion between them and the Roman Church. All these incidents coming together show that efforts are being made to profit by that disposition of minds in favor of unity of belief and identity of communion.

Cardinal Vaughan said: "One of the happiest signs of the times is the growing desire for the reunion of Christendom. This noble aspiration manifests itself outside the Church in societies at home and conferences abroad. It witnesses to a state of dissatisfaction with the religious divisions which cover England. It recognizes, at least in some degree, the incalculable evils which spring from the sin of schism. The pressure of grace and the Catholic instinct carry the minds of some still further. They ask themselves of what avail the exercise of many virtues by the soul that is an alien from unity and severed from the vine? They fear, with good reason, that their prayers and good works will not avail to salvation unless they are quickened with the life of the true vine, unless they are living members of the Body of Christ, which is His Church. With them the question of reunion is one of life or death."

There are some who in this movement are not led by proper motives and who seek union with other Christian Churches by a compromise of truth, by methods which are not based upon unity of dogma. This is the essential condition of true union, and all else must necessarily fail as being fictitious and as a covering for error. Such would be the union suggested by an Anglican appeal couched in these words:

"One effectual way of displaying the credentials of the Church of England to the world, and asserting the rights which those credentials bestow upon her, is for the thousands of Anglican Catholics who visit countries owing allegiance to the Pope to go as members of the Catholic Church for holy Communion to the churches of the land in which they are sojourning. Such an open and collective movement would do more for the Anglican communion abroad than building chapels has accomplished. Our duty is plain, the issues are with God."

Cardinal Vaughan characterized this method of procedure as a spiritual brigandage and wholesale sacrilege. To call themselves members of the Catholic Church and forcibly enter into a name which means for both two essentially distinct creeds is condemnable by all honest minds and can never lead to union. They are wolves in sheep's clothing who steal into the fold.

But on the other hand there are many earnest and prayerful souls who desire to be united to the true Church by the observance of the precepts and the profession of faith. They should not only command our sympathy, but our prayers and advice. Many are kept back only by domestic ties and by fear of losing that position by which alone they can gain a livelihood. The Holy Father is touched by the earnestness of many who are anxious to return to the Church, but who are deterred for this and many other similar reasons. Quite recently, in his "Encyclical to the Rulers and People of the World," the Holy Father has made a new appeal to the consciences of our separated brethren.

"Let us, one and all," he says, "for the sake of the common weal, labor assiduously to restore the ancient concord and union. To bring about this concord and to spread abroad the benefits of Christian revelation the present is the most reasonable time, for never before have the sentiments of human brotherhood penetrated so deeply into the souls of men, and never in any age has man been seen to seek out his fellow-countrymen more eagerly, in order to better both to know and help them."

Why should not our present century, which is hastening to its close, bequeath to mankind pledges of concord and the prospect of those great benefits which are dependent upon the unity of Christian faith?

The Church makes no compromise with error. She cannot accept a reunion on the basis of a common formula of belief which each one is allowed to interpret the formula as he pleases. There must be unity in the interpretation as well as in its outward expression. Moreover, the Church cannot accept reunion on the basis of simply believing in Christ; it must be based upon Christ as a living teacher and embrace everything which He has taught. All truths explicitly proclaimed or implicitly contained in Christ's teaching must constitute by necessity the material object of faith. If these conditions are not verified, if this basis is not accepted, then there can be no union, nor can the Church accept reunion if she be obliged to change in the slightest degree her constitution. This is divine, fixed by Her Founder and incapable of being modified or changed by man. These are truths which are immutable. But when there is simply discipline in

question, when it is merely a matter of legislation, the Church for a greater good may admit changes and modifications. Here we will use the Cardinal's own words:

"The invisible rock is Christ, the visible rock Peter, constituted in one solidity with Christ. These are truths which are immutable and no man can change them. But the Church is free for the sake of some greater good to admit changes and modifications in her discipline and in legislation which concerns times and circumstances. She has power over her own commandments and over questions of discipline, such as clerical celibacy, communion under both kinds, over her liturgy and the language in which the liturgy is clothed. Nor would she hesitate again to make concessions, as she did in times past, for the sake of some great good, could they be shown to surpass in value adherence to the points of discipline to be relaxed. Let so much suffice upon the general principle of concession or compromise."

Thus in the matter of compromise there can be none if it affects the truths of faith or the divine constitution of the Church. The Church, however (and the Cardinal speaks for England) will show herself condescending in things which she can change for the benefit of the Anglican clergy, provided she considers it to be for the spiritual benefit of their souls, and consequently for a greater good.—Philadelphia Catholic Times.

There are some who in this movement are not led by proper motives and who seek union with other Christian Churches by a compromise of truth, by methods which are not based upon unity of dogma. This is the essential condition of true union, and all else must necessarily fail as being fictitious and as a covering for error. Such would be the union suggested by an Anglican appeal couched in these words:

"One effectual way of displaying the credentials of the Church of England to the world, and asserting the rights which those credentials bestow upon her, is for the thousands of Anglican Catholics who visit countries owing allegiance to the Pope to go as members of the Catholic Church for holy Communion to the churches of the land in which they are sojourning. Such an open and collective movement would do more for the Anglican communion abroad than building chapels has accomplished. Our duty is plain, the issues are with God."

Cardinal Vaughan characterized this method of procedure as a spiritual brigandage and wholesale sacrilege. To call themselves members of the Catholic Church and forcibly enter into a name which means for both two essentially distinct creeds is condemnable by all honest minds and can never lead to union. They are wolves in sheep's clothing who steal into the fold.

But on the other hand there are many earnest and prayerful souls who desire to be united to the true Church by the observance of the precepts and the profession of faith. They should not only command our sympathy, but our prayers and advice. Many are kept back only by domestic ties and by fear of losing that position by which alone they can gain a livelihood. The Holy Father is touched by the earnestness of many who are anxious to return to the Church, but who are deterred for this and many other similar reasons. Quite recently, in his "Encyclical to the Rulers and People of the World," the Holy Father has made a new appeal to the consciences of our separated brethren.

"Let us, one and all," he says, "for the sake of the common weal, labor assiduously to restore the ancient concord and union. To bring about this concord and to spread abroad the benefits of Christian revelation the present is the most reasonable time, for never before have the sentiments of human brotherhood penetrated so deeply into the souls of men, and never in any age has man been seen to seek out his fellow-countrymen more eagerly, in order to better both to know and help them."

Why should not our present century, which is hastening to its close, bequeath to mankind pledges of concord and the prospect of those great benefits which are dependent upon the unity of Christian faith?

The Church makes no compromise with error. She cannot accept a reunion on the basis of a common formula of belief which each one is allowed to interpret the formula as he pleases. There must be unity in the interpretation as well as in its outward expression. Moreover, the Church cannot accept reunion on the basis of simply believing in Christ; it must be based upon Christ as a living teacher and embrace everything which He has taught. All truths explicitly proclaimed or implicitly contained in Christ's teaching must constitute by necessity the material object of faith. If these conditions are not verified, if this basis is not accepted, then there can be no union, nor can the Church accept reunion if she be obliged to change in the slightest degree her constitution. This is divine, fixed by Her Founder and incapable of being modified or changed by man. These are truths which are immutable. But when there is simply discipline in

question, when it is merely a matter of legislation, the Church for a greater good may admit changes and modifications. Here we will use the Cardinal's own words:

"The invisible rock is Christ, the visible rock Peter, constituted in one solidity with Christ. These are truths which are immutable and no man can change them. But the Church is free for the sake of some greater good to admit changes and modifications in her discipline and in legislation which concerns times and circumstances. She has power over her own commandments and over questions of discipline, such as clerical celibacy, communion under both kinds, over her liturgy and the language in which the liturgy is clothed. Nor would she hesitate again to make concessions, as she did in times past, for the sake of some great good, could they be shown to surpass in value adherence to the points of discipline to be relaxed. Let so much suffice upon the general principle of concession or compromise."

Thus in the matter of compromise there can be none if it affects the truths of faith or the divine constitution of the Church. The Church, however (and the Cardinal speaks for England) will show herself condescending in things which she can change for the benefit of the Anglican clergy, provided she considers it to be for the spiritual benefit of their souls, and consequently for a greater good.—Philadelphia Catholic Times.

There are some who in this movement are not led by proper motives and who seek union with other Christian Churches by a compromise of truth, by methods which are not based upon unity of dogma. This is the essential condition of true union, and all else must necessarily fail as being fictitious and as a covering for error. Such would be the union suggested by an Anglican appeal couched in these words:

"One effectual way of displaying the credentials of the Church of England to the world, and asserting the rights which those credentials bestow upon her, is for the thousands of Anglican Catholics who visit countries owing allegiance to the Pope to go as members of the Catholic Church for holy Communion to the churches of the land in which they are sojourning. Such an open and collective movement would do more for the Anglican communion abroad than building chapels has accomplished. Our duty is plain, the issues are with God."

Cardinal Vaughan characterized this method of procedure as a spiritual brigandage and wholesale sacrilege. To call themselves members of the Catholic Church and forcibly enter into a name which means for both two essentially distinct creeds is condemnable by all honest minds and can never lead to union. They are wolves in sheep's clothing who steal into the fold.

But on the other hand there are many earnest and prayerful souls who desire to be united to the true Church by the observance of the precepts and the profession of faith. They should not only command our sympathy, but our prayers and advice. Many are kept back only by domestic ties and by fear of losing that position by which alone they can gain a livelihood. The Holy Father is touched by the earnestness of many who are anxious to return to the Church, but who are deterred for this and many other similar reasons. Quite recently, in his "Encyclical to the Rulers and People of the World," the Holy Father has made a new appeal to the consciences of our separated brethren.

"Let us, one and all," he says, "for the sake of the common weal, labor assiduously to restore the ancient concord and union. To bring about this concord and to spread abroad the benefits of Christian revelation the present is the most reasonable time, for never before have the sentiments of human brotherhood penetrated so deeply into the souls of men, and never in any age has man been seen to seek out his fellow-countrymen more eagerly, in order to better both to know and help them."

Why should not our present century, which is hastening to its close, bequeath to mankind pledges of concord and the prospect of those great benefits which are dependent upon the unity of Christian faith?

The Church makes no compromise with error. She cannot accept a reunion on the basis of a common formula of belief which each one is allowed to interpret the formula as he pleases. There must be unity in the interpretation as well as in its outward expression. Moreover, the Church cannot accept reunion on the basis of simply believing in Christ; it must be based upon Christ as a living teacher and embrace everything which He has taught. All truths explicitly proclaimed or implicitly contained in Christ's teaching must constitute by necessity the material object of faith. If these conditions are not verified, if this basis is not accepted, then there can be no union, nor can the Church accept reunion if she be obliged to change in the slightest degree her constitution. This is divine, fixed by Her Founder and incapable of being modified or changed by man. These are truths which are immutable. But when there is simply discipline in

question, when it is merely a matter of legislation, the Church for a greater good may admit changes and modifications. Here we will use the Cardinal's own words:

"The invisible rock is Christ, the visible rock Peter, constituted in one solidity with Christ. These are truths which are immutable and no man can change them. But the Church is free for the sake of some greater good to admit changes and modifications in her discipline and in legislation which concerns times and circumstances. She has power over her own commandments and over questions of discipline, such as clerical celibacy, communion under both kinds, over her liturgy and the language in which the liturgy is clothed. Nor would she hesitate again to make concessions, as she did in times past, for the sake of some great good, could they be shown to surpass in value adherence to the points of discipline to be relaxed. Let so much suffice upon the general principle of concession or compromise."

Thus in the matter of compromise there can be none if it affects the truths of faith or the divine constitution of the Church. The Church, however (and the Cardinal speaks for England) will show herself condescending in things which she can change for the benefit of the Anglican clergy, provided she considers it to be for the spiritual benefit of their souls, and consequently for a greater good.—Philadelphia Catholic Times.

There are some who in this movement are not led by proper motives and who seek union with other Christian Churches by a compromise of truth, by methods which are not based upon unity of dogma. This is the essential condition of true union, and all else must necessarily fail as being fictitious and as a covering for error. Such would be the union suggested by an Anglican appeal couched in these words:

"One effectual way of displaying the credentials of the Church of England to the world, and asserting the rights which those credentials bestow upon her, is for the thousands of Anglican Catholics who visit countries owing allegiance to the Pope to go as members of the Catholic Church for holy Communion to the churches of the land in which they are sojourning. Such an open and collective movement would do more for the Anglican communion abroad than building chapels has accomplished. Our duty is plain, the issues are with God."

Cardinal Vaughan characterized this method of procedure as a spiritual brigandage and wholesale sacrilege. To call themselves members of the Catholic Church and forcibly enter into a name which means for both two essentially distinct creeds is condemnable by all honest minds and can never lead to union. They are wolves in sheep's clothing who steal into the fold.

But on the other hand there are many earnest and prayerful souls who desire to be united to the true Church by the observance of the precepts and the profession of faith. They should not only command our sympathy, but our prayers and advice. Many are kept back only by domestic ties and by fear of losing that position by which alone they can gain a livelihood. The Holy Father is touched by the earnestness of many who are anxious to return to the Church, but who are deterred for this and many other similar reasons. Quite recently, in his "Encyclical to the Rulers and People of the World," the Holy Father has made a new appeal to the consciences of our separated brethren.

"Let us, one and all," he says, "for the sake of the common weal, labor assiduously to restore the ancient concord and union. To bring about this concord and to spread abroad the benefits of Christian revelation the present is the most reasonable time, for never before have the sentiments of human brotherhood penetrated so deeply into the souls of men, and never in any age has man been seen to seek out his fellow-countrymen more eagerly, in order to better both to know and help them."

Why should not our present century, which is hastening to its close, bequeath to mankind pledges of concord and the prospect of those great benefits which are dependent upon the unity of Christian faith?

The Church makes no compromise with error. She cannot accept a reunion on the basis of a common formula of belief which each one is allowed to interpret the formula as he pleases. There must be unity in the interpretation as well as in its outward expression. Moreover, the Church cannot accept reunion on the basis of simply believing in Christ; it must be based upon Christ as a living teacher and embrace everything which He has taught. All truths explicitly proclaimed or implicitly contained in Christ's teaching must constitute by necessity the material object of faith. If these conditions are not verified, if this basis is not accepted, then there can be no union, nor can the Church accept reunion if she be obliged to change in the slightest degree her constitution. This is divine, fixed by Her Founder and incapable of being modified or changed by man. These are truths which are immutable. But when there is simply discipline in

question, when it is merely a matter of legislation, the Church for a greater good may admit changes and modifications. Here we will use the Cardinal's own words:

"The invisible rock is Christ, the visible rock Peter, constituted in one solidity with Christ. These are truths which are immutable and no man can change them. But the Church is free for the sake of some greater good to admit changes and modifications in her discipline and in legislation which concerns times and circumstances. She has power over her own commandments and over questions of discipline, such as clerical celibacy, communion under both kinds, over her liturgy and the language in which the liturgy is clothed. Nor would she hesitate again to make concessions, as she did in times past, for the sake of some great good, could they be shown to surpass in value adherence to the points of discipline to be relaxed. Let so much suffice upon the general principle of concession or compromise."

Thus in the matter of compromise there can be none if it affects the truths of faith or the divine constitution of the Church. The Church, however (and the Cardinal speaks for England) will show herself condescending in things which she can change for the benefit of the Anglican clergy, provided she considers it to be for the spiritual benefit of their souls, and consequently for a greater good.—Philadelphia Catholic Times.

There are some who in this movement are not led by proper motives and who seek union with other Christian Churches by a compromise of truth, by methods which are not based upon unity of dogma. This is the essential condition of true union, and all else must necessarily fail as being fictitious and as a covering for error. Such would be the union suggested by an Anglican appeal couched in these words:

"One effectual way of displaying the credentials of the Church of England to the world, and asserting the rights which those credentials bestow upon her, is for the thousands of Anglican Catholics who visit countries owing allegiance to the Pope to go as members of the Catholic Church for holy Communion to the churches of the land in which they are sojourning. Such an open and collective movement would do more for the Anglican communion abroad than building chapels has accomplished. Our duty is plain, the issues are with God."

Cardinal Vaughan characterized this method of procedure as a spiritual brigandage and wholesale sacrilege. To call themselves members of the Catholic Church and forcibly enter into a name which means for both two essentially distinct creeds is condemnable by all honest minds and can never lead to union. They are wolves in sheep's clothing who steal into the fold.

But on the other hand there are many earnest and prayerful souls who desire to be united to the true Church by the observance of the precepts and the profession of faith. They should not only command our sympathy, but our prayers and advice. Many are kept back only by domestic ties and by fear of losing that position by which alone they can gain a livelihood. The Holy Father is touched by the earnestness of many who are anxious to return to the Church, but who are deterred for this and many other similar reasons. Quite recently, in his "Encyclical to the Rulers and People of the World," the Holy Father has made a new appeal to the consciences of our separated brethren.

"Let us, one and all," he says, "for the sake of the common weal, labor assiduously to restore the ancient concord and union. To bring about this concord and to spread abroad the benefits of Christian revelation the present is the most reasonable time, for never before have the sentiments of human brotherhood penetrated so deeply into the souls of men, and never in any age has man been seen to seek out his fellow-countrymen more eagerly, in order to better both to know and help them."

meeting were increased in nine months to 156,000. From all parts of Ireland pilgrims came to Cork to see Father Mathew, to take the pledge from, and be blessed by him. Limerick, Waterford, Dublin and the Protestant north received him as a conqueror, signed his pledge, wore his medals and formed an army of temperate men such as the world has never seen before.

In 1842 he went to Scotland, in 1843 to England, and the same enthusiastic success met him everywhere. His health failing, rest was ordered. Difficulties arose, as difficulties will come in the pathway of all reform. O'Connell, recognizing the elements of strength for his repeal movement from the temperance body, himself entered its ranks. The famine, which makes men sad with even the thoughts of its horrors, devastated the country and broke the courage of the great leaders of the people both in social and political reform, and buried for a time the aspirations of the nation. America had opened its hospitable home to the oppressed and starving peasantry of Ireland. Father Mathew saw the Irish in this land of freedom, with character and intellect inferior to none, in the presence of gifts and honors free to all. He saw the fiend that destroyed his character abroad. He learned of the inroads that intemperance was making among them, and despite entreaties and threats—despite certain death by reason of his health—he set out for America in June, 1849. New York received him with enthusiasm, the governor of Massachusetts, the great men of the State, irrespective of race and religion, welcomed him to Boston. Salem opened its arms to receive him, every town in the State did him honor and thousands of men CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT KNELT AT HIS FEET.

He took the pledge and wore his medal. The abolitionists who strove to utilize him for their party against slavery found that he had one idea and that, the abolition of the slavery of intemperance. He hated the slavery of the black man, and had so expressed himself in Ireland with O'Connell, but he hated still more the slavery of drink, which enchained white and black alike. His well-known opinion on slavery drew upon him from the South in certain quarters, and even in Congress, the disapproval of prominent statesmen, but he was determined to allow no shade of politics to enter into his temperance movement. In spite of this

OPPOSITION HE WAS HONORED IN CONGRESS

and Cass, Clay and Seward eulogized his glorious deeds in the interest of humanity. He traversed the United States, visiting over twenty-five States, administering the pledge in ever three hundred cities and towns, carrying with him on his return a scroll bearing the names of over six hundred thousand men pledged to total abstinence. His work was done and he returned to Ireland in 1851, shattered in health, but full of honors from a grateful humanity. He died Oct. 8, 1856. His country and the world met his death with regret, his God met it with reward everlasting. The characteristics of his life were benevolence, self-sacrifice and disinterestedness: in one word, his life was charity. Like the great Master, whose minister he was, he went about doing good; he crystallized the Christian idea of self-denial. He found humanity by the roadside suffering, and, like a good Samaritan, he set to work to relieve its wants. He found one of its great diseases to be drunkenness, from which pauperism and crime sprang, and his benevolence led him to labor to diminish these evils by striking at them in their source, which is intemperance. This was his mission, and this the ideal of his life.

Tired, Weak, Nervous. Means impure blood, and overwork or too much strain on brain and body. The only way to cure is to feel the nerves on pure blood. Thousands of people certify that the best blood purifier, the best nerve tonic and strength builder is Hood's Sarsaparilla. What it has done for others it will also do for you—Hood's Cures.

