

# The True Witness and Catholic Chronicle.

Printed and Published by the True Witness P. & P. Co., Limited,  
253 St. James Street, Montreal, Canada.

P. O. BOX 1138.

## SUBSCRIPTION PRICE

CITY OF MONTREAL, Delivered,	-	\$1.50
OTHER PARTS OF CANADA,	-	1.00
UNITED STATES,	-	1.00
NEWFOUNDLAND,	-	1.00
GREAT BRITAIN, IRELAND and FRANCE,	-	1.50
BELGIUM, ITALY, GERMANY and AUSTRALIA,	-	2.00

All communications should be addressed to the Managing Director,  
"True Witness" P. & P. Co., Limited, P. O. Box 1138.

TERMS, PAYABLE IN ADVANCE.

## EPISCOPAL APPROBATION.

If the English Speaking Catholics of Montreal and of this Province consulted their best interests, they would soon make of the TRUE WITNESS one of the most prosperous and powerful Catholic papers in this country. I heartily bless those who encourage this excellent work.

PAUL, Archbishop of Montreal.

SATURDAY, February 25th, 1899.

### ALD. KINSELLA AND THE WATER COMMITTEE.

While Alderman Ames is an estimable young man in many respects, there was something patronizing in his attitude towards Alderman Kinsella, when, after assisting to displace him from the Chairmanship of the Water Committee, he offered the Irish-Catholic his own less important chairmanship of the Parks and Ferries Committee.

It does not seem to be generally known that for the past quarter of a century the chairmanship of the Water Committee has belonged, by the right of custom, to the Irish element. For a period of ten years John McGauvran held the office, and during his tenure it some of the principal works in connection with that department, such as the wheelhouse, were constructed. For about a similar period that staunch and estimable Irishman, Peter Donovan occupied the same position; and while he held the office many important improvements to our water system were made.

In view of these facts, the attitude of the aldermen who assisted Alderman Sadler and Ames, to deprive us of this important chairmanship—the only one allotted to us—is all the more unjust and irritating. As far as Alderman Ames is concerned, we speak for ourselves, when we say that his offer to vacate his Chairmanship should be rejected.

There is another phase of this matter which has caused us no small surprise; and that is the action of Ald. Laporte. For nearly twenty years Ald. Laporte has worked side by side with the Irish Catholics of St. Ann's Ward, and has been regarded as, in a special sense, a staunch friend of our people; so that we felt that we could rely upon him in every emergency as such. When the Irish Catholic chairmanship had been offered to and refused by Ald. Clearihue—from what motives we do not know—it was then that Ald. Laporte's friendship and loyalty to our race was put to the test. Did he then remember his long years of association with our people? Did he realize that in order to preserve harmony it is necessary to recognize the rights of that section of the population which had so long held the chairmanship that had been offered to him? No; he failed to rise to the occasion, which then presented itself to him.

This is not the first instance in which the Irish element have found that they have been deserted when the help of some of the French Canadian element was most needed. Had Mr. Laporte been imbued with a proper estimation of our people he would have indignantly repudiated any attempt on the part of Messrs. Sadler and Ames to deprive the Irish Catholics of an important chairmanship in order to give it to a Protestant. We should have expected that Ald. Laporte, when his name was mentioned for the chairmanship, would not only have done as Ald. Clearihue did, —namely, declined it— but would have shown himself to be a champion of the rights of all sections of the community and a friend, especial-

ly, of the Irish element. It is not for us a question of persons. It is a question of principle. The chairmanship of the Water Committee belongs of right to a representative of the Irish element; and it should be occupied by an Irish Alderman.

### ST. PATRICK'S SOCIETY AND THE HIGH SCHOOL.

From what we consider a reliable source we have learned that, on the occasion of the last monthly meeting of St. Patrick's Society, notice of motion was given that at the next monthly meeting the treasurer would be asked to set aside five hundred dollars, from the funds of the Association, to be contributed to the erection and maintenance of the new Catholic High School.

It seems to us that there is a peculiar wisdom in suggesting such a contribution, especially coming from that parent organization. The proposal, it also seems to us, is virtually an investment of that portion of the society's funds, for the benefit of future members.

We know that it is the desire of the President, officers and members of St. Patrick's Society to perpetuate an organization that has for so many generations been associated with the rise and development of the Irish Catholic element in this city, and indirectly throughout Canada. The present members are but the successors of the hundreds who have gone before them, and they are carrying on the work that their predecessors commenced. Time is on the wing; a few decades more and another generation will, in its turn, be taking up the patriotic task that those of to-day so nobly accomplished. The existence of the future prosperity, and the perpetuation on the same lines, of St. Patrick's Society must of necessity depend on the membership to be secured from the ranks of the rising, or rather the younger generation. It is therefore obvious to all who reflect that the stability of principle, the preservation of nationalism, the propagation of Catholicity—all which have ever been characteristics of the Society—must, to a great extent, be swayed by the education of those who are to be the men of the near future. Consequently such a proposal as that of a contribution to so worthy an object as the Catholic High School, is a donation by the present members of the Society for the education, the instruction, the training of those who are to one day fill their places and continue the traditions of their organization as time rolls onward.

This thought should be alone sufficient to secure for the proposal the unanimous support of the members.

It seems to us that there is a peculiar wisdom in suggesting such a contribution, especially coming from that parent organization. The proposal, it also seems to us, is virtually an investment of that portion of the society's funds, for the benefit of future members.

We know that it is the desire of the President, officers and members of St. Patrick's Society to perpetuate an organization that has for so many generations been associated with the rise and development of the Irish Catholic element in this city, and indirectly throughout Canada. The present members are but the successors of the hundreds who have gone before them, and they are carrying on the work that their predecessors commenced. Time is on the wing; a few decades more and another generation will, in its turn, be taking up the patriotic task that those of to-day so nobly accomplished. The existence of the future prosperity, and the perpetuation on the same lines, of St. Patrick's Society must of necessity depend on the membership to be secured from the ranks of the rising, or rather the younger generation. It is therefore obvious to all who reflect that the stability of principle, the preservation of nationalism, the propagation of Catholicity—all which have ever been characteristics of the Society—must, to a great extent, be swayed by the education of those who are to be the men of the near future. Consequently such a proposal as that of a contribution to so worthy an object as the Catholic High School, is a donation by the present members of the Society for the education, the instruction, the training of those who are to one day fill their places and continue the traditions of their organization as time rolls onward.

This thought should be alone sufficient to secure for the proposal the unanimous support of the members.

This thought should be alone sufficient to secure for the proposal the unanimous support of the members.

This thought should be alone sufficient to secure for the proposal the unanimous support of the members.

This thought should be alone sufficient to secure for the proposal the unanimous support of the members.

This thought should be alone sufficient to secure for the proposal the unanimous support of the members.

This thought should be alone sufficient to secure for the proposal the unanimous support of the members.

This thought should be alone sufficient to secure for the proposal the unanimous support of the members.

of Leo XIII. that mysteriousness is most strikingly manifested. Popes have lived older than he; one even celebrated his hundredth year; but few, if any, have developed after 80 as much strength and capacity for statesmanship as has the present Vicar of Christ. Of all the great, the remarkable, the famous old men of the nineteenth century he alone remains. Of his contemporaries not one is alive. Gladstone has almost passed into the realm of history; Long does it seem that he has made his exit from the public arena; the Iron Chancellor lives only in memoirs, that are being published, and that in no way serve to enhance his fame; all the sovereigns of Europe—except Queen Victoria—whom Leo XIII., had known and had communicated with have passed away, and he really might say, in the words of Whittier:—

"I am the last leaf upon the tree."  
At the close of this wonderful century, the sublime figure of Leo still attracts the gaze—like the last mountain of Deluge over the unbroken expanse, when all other great peaks had vanished in the flood. And he is not a broken down ruler, nor an exhausted power; rather is he daily giving evidence of most astounding activity and mental force. In the natural course of events it cannot be reasonably expected that His Holiness should see many more years, yet we trust and pray that the prediction of Dr. Lapponi, the Vatican physician, may be more than fulfilled; that eminent medical authority expressed the opinion that Leo XIII. would be as well as he is to-day on January 1st, 1901 — when he purposes ushering in the twentieth century, by special elaborate ceremonies in St. Peter's. Humble as our voice is, we raise it gladly in the course of congratulations that will greet the great Pontiff on the 3rd of March, next.

At the close of this wonderful century, the sublime figure of Leo still attracts the gaze—like the last mountain of Deluge over the unbroken expanse, when all other great peaks had vanished in the flood. And he is not a broken down ruler, nor an exhausted power; rather is he daily giving evidence of most astounding activity and mental force. In the natural course of events it cannot be reasonably expected that His Holiness should see many more years, yet we trust and pray that the prediction of Dr. Lapponi, the Vatican physician, may be more than fulfilled; that eminent medical authority expressed the opinion that Leo XIII. would be as well as he is to-day on January 1st, 1901 — when he purposes ushering in the twentieth century, by special elaborate ceremonies in St. Peter's. Humble as our voice is, we raise it gladly in the course of congratulations that will greet the great Pontiff on the 3rd of March, next.

At the close of this wonderful century, the sublime figure of Leo still attracts the gaze—like the last mountain of Deluge over the unbroken expanse, when all other great peaks had vanished in the flood. And he is not a broken down ruler, nor an exhausted power; rather is he daily giving evidence of most astounding activity and mental force. In the natural course of events it cannot be reasonably expected that His Holiness should see many more years, yet we trust and pray that the prediction of Dr. Lapponi, the Vatican physician, may be more than fulfilled; that eminent medical authority expressed the opinion that Leo XIII. would be as well as he is to-day on January 1st, 1901 — when he purposes ushering in the twentieth century, by special elaborate ceremonies in St. Peter's. Humble as our voice is, we raise it gladly in the course of congratulations that will greet the great Pontiff on the 3rd of March, next.

At the close of this wonderful century, the sublime figure of Leo still attracts the gaze—like the last mountain of Deluge over the unbroken expanse, when all other great peaks had vanished in the flood. And he is not a broken down ruler, nor an exhausted power; rather is he daily giving evidence of most astounding activity and mental force. In the natural course of events it cannot be reasonably expected that His Holiness should see many more years, yet we trust and pray that the prediction of Dr. Lapponi, the Vatican physician, may be more than fulfilled; that eminent medical authority expressed the opinion that Leo XIII. would be as well as he is to-day on January 1st, 1901 — when he purposes ushering in the twentieth century, by special elaborate ceremonies in St. Peter's. Humble as our voice is, we raise it gladly in the course of congratulations that will greet the great Pontiff on the 3rd of March, next.

### THE CORONATION OATH.

It is remarkable how often a chance expression, or an accidental circumstance gives rise to most important movements, and produces most unexpected results. In the course of his ordinary duties as pastor of St. Joseph's Parish, Ottawa, the Rev. Father Fallon, O.M.L., recently made a reference, in one of his sermons, to the offensive terms comprised in the British Coronation oath. The subject was new it was treated in a novel manner, and as few persons had ever given any special attention to the matter, it at once awakened a very deep and keen interest. The result was that the Catholic Truth Society, of Ottawa, took up the question, Father Fallon was asked to enlarge his remarks in the form of a lecture, resolutions were adopted in consequence, and the secular—non-Catholic—press of the Capital strongly agreed with the statements of the Rev. Lecturer, and sympathized with the views of all Catholic British subjects, concerning the amending of the form used in the Coronation oath. We could not better convey an idea of the whole movement, than by reproducing the resolutions adopted on that occasion, as well as the objectionable section of the oath, and some of Father Fallon's leading comments thereon.

The resolutions speak for themselves:—  
It was moved by B. B. Sulte, F. R. S. C., and seconded by M. J. Gorman, L.L.B., and adopted unanimously: "That the Roman Catholics of Ottawa, as loyal subjects of the British empire, desire to express their regret that there should be required of the sovereign of the empire, at coronation or at any other time, a declaration against transubstantiation, by which the sacrifice of the Mass and other doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church are stigmatized as superstitious and idolatrous.

"That they sincerely trust that the spirit of broad toleration which, within the reign of Her Most Gracious Majesty and the two preceding sovereigns removed this declaration from the statute books, so far as members of Parliament, peers of the realm and office holders are concerned, will, at the request of humble but dutiful servants of the empire, cause it to be repealed in so far as it relates to the supreme head of the state.

"That they believe that the removal of this objectionable declaration would enable the Roman Catholics of the empire to enter, with more profound feeling of loyal affection, into the spirit of a ceremony, which should be the occasion of nothing but mutual esteem and good will, on the part of both sovereign and subjects."

It may be well here to add the terms used by the sovereign of Great Britain in taking the Coronation oath:—  
"I, A. B., by the grace of God, King (or Queen) of Great Britain and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, do solemnly and sincerely, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do believe in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper there is

not any transubstantiation of the elements of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ at or after the consecration thereof, by any person whatsoever; and that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary or any other saint, and the sacrifice of the Mass, as they are now used in the Church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous. And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare, that I do make this declaration and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants, without any evasion, equivocation or mental reservation whatsoever, and without any dispensation already granted me for this purpose by the Pope or any other authority or person whatsoever, or without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration or any part thereof, although the Pope or any other person or persons, or power whatsoever, should dispense with or annul the same or declare that it was null and void from the beginning."

We can readily understand how offensive and insulting such a declaration must be in the minds and to the feelings of twelve million Roman Catholic subjects of Her (or His) Britannic Majesty. Queen Anne, in 1782, was the first sovereign to subscribe to this declaration. Since then it has been repeated by each succeeding monarch who has ascended the British throne.

Father Fallon spoke of the sense of humiliation which the present Queen must have experienced, when, a young girl of eighteen years, she was required to repeat words so foreign to her sentiments and which brand in no mild tone as idolatrous and superstitious a large section of her most devoted subjects. Without entering into the questions of faith—the truth of error or doctrines—the lecturer pointed out that this was not a national, nor yet a religious issue, but a matter of public policy. In 1828, O'Connell refused the oath; he was therefore prevented from taking his seat in the House of Commons. He went back to Clare, was re-elected, and returned to again refuse to take the oath. The result was emancipation in 1829; the oath was amended to suit the Catholic conscience as far as members of Parliament were concerned. By degrees, it was amended in a similar manner, through the efforts of the historian Lingard, and Sir Coleman O'Loughlin, until 1867, a bill passed the House of Lords, by virtue which no British subject was thenceforth obliged to make the declarations of the oath. Most logically does Father Fallon thus argue:—  
"Now, it is offensive and unjust for Catholics to be termed idolatrous by the subjects of the Crown, the offensiveness and injustice are increased beyond endurance when the charge is made by the sovereign and on the most solemn occasion. Every argument used in favor of the abolition of the oath for office-holders makes with ten-fold force against its being taken by the Supreme Head of the State."

If we mistake not, on a recent occasion one of the Lieutenant-Governors of this Province declined to take the oath of office on account of objectionable expressions contained therein; and, in consequence, the form of the oath was changed. What could be changed for a Lieutenant-Governor may be changed also for a Governor-General, and with still more reason for the sovereign whom both of them represent.

In any case, the movement is now on foot, how strongly it will be pushed remains to be seen; but, certainly, the Catholics of Canada and of all the empire owe a debt of gratitude to Rev. Father Fallon, for his manly and timely initiative, and to the Catholic Truth Society of Ottawa for having so readily taken up the question and brought it before the public. While we know the Coronation oath is more a matter of form than of policy, still we hoped that those who commenced this laudable work will soon behold their efforts crowned with success, and that these objectionable terms will be forever blotted off the page of the statute book.

### THE "EX-PRIEST."

In referring, when unhappily occasion required, to any of those unfortunate men who, having been raised to the dignity of Catholic priesthood, have, for one cause or another, fallen away and abandoned the Church, we have always been careful not to make use of the term "ex-priest." The expression "ex" prefixed to a word that indicates a function, or a state conveys the idea of the disappearance of such function, and the non-existence of such a state. We speak of an "ex-governor," an "ex-mayor," an "ex-lawyer," an "ex-member of Parliament"; in so doing we mean to state that the person in

question is no longer a governor, a mayor, a lawyer, or a member of Parliament, and this also includes the statement that such person has no longer the right, or power to exercise the functions peculiar to the state, office, or profession indicated. In the same sense there may be "ex-monks," "ex-nuns," and "ex-Catholics." That is to say, a person who once belonged to a religious order—male or female—even as a person who once belonged to the Catholic Church, may of free will abandon that state, or that faith, and go abroad in the world with the right to the prefix of "ex."

But in the case of a priest of the Church of Rome, provided he be a really ordained priest, there can be no "ex" applicable. He may leave the Church, he may attack the Church, he may abandon all the rights and privileges of priesthood, he may despise the functions of that high office, but he cannot cease to be a priest, he cannot divest himself of the sacerdotal state, he cannot efface the effects of ordination. Therefore, it is morally and actually impossible for a genuine priest to become an "ex-priest." He may become a renegade priest, an anti-Catholic priest, a priest-hating priest, or any other stamp of priest; but he remains a priest, all the same, and all the "exs" that he could write in a year before his name would not make him less a priest. It seems to us that this should be the most fearful thought that could haunt the soul of the unworthy priest.

But in the case of a priest of the Church of Rome, provided he be a really ordained priest, there can be no "ex" applicable. He may leave the Church, he may attack the Church, he may abandon all the rights and privileges of priesthood, he may despise the functions of that high office, but he cannot cease to be a priest, he cannot divest himself of the sacerdotal state, he cannot efface the effects of ordination. Therefore, it is morally and actually impossible for a genuine priest to become an "ex-priest." He may become a renegade priest, an anti-Catholic priest, a priest-hating priest, or any other stamp of priest; but he remains a priest, all the same, and all the "exs" that he could write in a year before his name would not make him less a priest. It seems to us that this should be the most fearful thought that could haunt the soul of the unworthy priest.

But in the case of a priest of the Church of Rome, provided he be a really ordained priest, there can be no "ex" applicable. He may leave the Church, he may attack the Church, he may abandon all the rights and privileges of priesthood, he may despise the functions of that high office, but he cannot cease to be a priest, he cannot divest himself of the sacerdotal state, he cannot efface the effects of ordination. Therefore, it is morally and actually impossible for a genuine priest to become an "ex-priest." He may become a renegade priest, an anti-Catholic priest, a priest-hating priest, or any other stamp of priest; but he remains a priest, all the same, and all the "exs" that he could write in a year before his name would not make him less a priest. It seems to us that this should be the most fearful thought that could haunt the soul of the unworthy priest.

But in the case of a priest of the Church of Rome, provided he be a really ordained priest, there can be no "ex" applicable. He may leave the Church, he may attack the Church, he may abandon all the rights and privileges of priesthood, he may despise the functions of that high office, but he cannot cease to be a priest, he cannot divest himself of the sacerdotal state, he cannot efface the effects of ordination. Therefore, it is morally and actually impossible for a genuine priest to become an "ex-priest." He may become a renegade priest, an anti-Catholic priest, a priest-hating priest, or any other stamp of priest; but he remains a priest, all the same, and all the "exs" that he could write in a year before his name would not make him less a priest. It seems to us that this should be the most fearful thought that could haunt the soul of the unworthy priest.

But in the case of a priest of the Church of Rome, provided he be a really ordained priest, there can be no "ex" applicable. He may leave the Church, he may attack the Church, he may abandon all the rights and privileges of priesthood, he may despise the functions of that high office, but he cannot cease to be a priest, he cannot divest himself of the sacerdotal state, he cannot efface the effects of ordination. Therefore, it is morally and actually impossible for a genuine priest to become an "ex-priest." He may become a renegade priest, an anti-Catholic priest, a priest-hating priest, or any other stamp of priest; but he remains a priest, all the same, and all the "exs" that he could write in a year before his name would not make him less a priest. It seems to us that this should be the most fearful thought that could haunt the soul of the unworthy priest.

But in the case of a priest of the Church of Rome, provided he be a really ordained priest, there can be no "ex" applicable. He may leave the Church, he may attack the Church, he may abandon all the rights and privileges of priesthood, he may despise the functions of that high office, but he cannot cease to be a priest, he cannot divest himself of the sacerdotal state, he cannot efface the effects of ordination. Therefore, it is morally and actually impossible for a genuine priest to become an "ex-priest." He may become a renegade priest, an anti-Catholic priest, a priest-hating priest, or any other stamp of priest; but he remains a priest, all the same, and all the "exs" that he could write in a year before his name would not make him less a priest. It seems to us that this should be the most fearful thought that could haunt the soul of the unworthy priest.

But in the case of a priest of the Church of Rome, provided he be a really ordained priest, there can be no "ex" applicable. He may leave the Church, he may attack the Church, he may abandon all the rights and privileges of priesthood, he may despise the functions of that high office, but he cannot cease to be a priest, he cannot divest himself of the sacerdotal state, he cannot efface the effects of ordination. Therefore, it is morally and actually impossible for a genuine priest to become an "ex-priest." He may become a renegade priest, an anti-Catholic priest, a priest-hating priest, or any other stamp of priest; but he remains a priest, all the same, and all the "exs" that he could write in a year before his name would not make him less a priest. It seems to us that this should be the most fearful thought that could haunt the soul of the unworthy priest.

But in the case of a priest of the Church of Rome, provided he be a really ordained priest, there can be no "ex" applicable. He may leave the Church, he may attack the Church, he may abandon all the rights and privileges of priesthood, he may despise the functions of that high office, but he cannot cease to be a priest, he cannot divest himself of the sacerdotal state, he cannot efface the effects of ordination. Therefore, it is morally and actually impossible for a genuine priest to become an "ex-priest." He may become a renegade priest, an anti-Catholic priest, a priest-hating priest, or any other stamp of priest; but he remains a priest, all the same, and all the "exs" that he could write in a year before his name would not make him less a priest. It seems to us that this should be the most fearful thought that could haunt the soul of the unworthy priest.

But in the case of a priest of the Church of Rome, provided he be a really ordained priest, there can be no "ex" applicable. He may leave the Church, he may attack the Church, he may abandon all the rights and privileges of priesthood, he may despise the functions of that high office, but he cannot cease to be a priest, he cannot divest himself of the sacerdotal state, he cannot efface the effects of ordination. Therefore, it is morally and actually impossible for a genuine priest to become an "ex-priest." He may become a renegade priest, an anti-Catholic priest, a priest-hating priest, or any other stamp of priest; but he remains a priest, all the same, and all the "exs" that he could write in a year before his name would not make him less a priest. It seems to us that this should be the most fearful thought that could haunt the soul of the unworthy priest.

But in the case of a priest of the Church of Rome, provided he be a really ordained priest, there can be no "ex" applicable. He may leave the Church, he may attack the Church, he may abandon all the rights and privileges of priesthood, he may despise the functions of that high office, but he cannot cease to be a priest, he cannot divest himself of the sacerdotal state, he cannot efface the effects of ordination. Therefore, it is morally and actually impossible for a genuine priest to become an "ex-priest." He may become a renegade priest, an anti-Catholic priest, a priest-hating priest, or any other stamp of priest; but he remains a priest, all the same, and all the "exs" that he could write in a year before his name would not make him less a priest. It seems to us that this should be the most fearful thought that could haunt the soul of the unworthy priest.

But in the case of a priest of the Church of Rome, provided he be a really ordained priest, there can be no "ex" applicable. He may leave the Church, he may attack the Church, he may abandon all the rights and privileges of priesthood, he may despise the functions of that high office, but he cannot cease to be a priest, he cannot divest himself of the sacerdotal state, he cannot efface the effects of ordination. Therefore, it is morally and actually impossible for a genuine priest to become an "ex-priest." He may become a renegade priest, an anti-Catholic priest, a priest-hating priest, or any other stamp of priest; but he remains a priest, all the same, and all the "exs" that he could write in a year before his name would not make him less a priest. It seems to us that this should be the most fearful thought that could haunt the soul of the unworthy priest.

But in the case of a priest of the Church of Rome, provided he be a really ordained priest, there can be no "ex" applicable. He may leave the Church, he may attack the Church, he may abandon all the rights and privileges of priesthood, he may despise the functions of that high office, but he cannot cease to be a priest, he cannot divest himself of the sacerdotal state, he cannot efface the effects of ordination. Therefore, it is morally and actually impossible for a genuine priest to become an "ex-priest." He may become a renegade priest, an anti-Catholic priest, a priest-hating priest, or any other stamp of priest; but he remains a priest, all the same, and all the "exs" that he could write in a year before his name would not make him less a priest. It seems to us that this should be the most fearful thought that could haunt the soul of the unworthy priest.

But in the case of a priest of the Church of Rome, provided he be a really ordained priest, there can be no "ex" applicable. He may leave the Church, he may attack the Church, he may abandon all the rights and privileges of priesthood, he may despise the functions of that high office, but he cannot cease to be a priest, he cannot divest himself of the sacerdotal state, he cannot efface the effects of ordination. Therefore, it is morally and actually impossible for a genuine priest to become an "ex-priest." He may become a renegade priest, an anti-Catholic priest, a priest-hating priest, or any other stamp of priest; but he remains a priest, all the same, and all the "exs" that he could write in a year before his name would not make him less a priest. It seems to us that this should be the most fearful thought that could haunt the soul of the unworthy priest.

But in the case of a priest of the Church of Rome, provided he be a really ordained priest, there can be no "ex" applicable. He may leave the Church, he may attack the Church, he may abandon all the rights and privileges of priesthood, he may despise the functions of that high office, but he cannot cease to be a priest, he cannot divest himself of the sacerdotal state, he cannot efface the effects of ordination. Therefore, it is morally and actually impossible for a genuine priest to become an "ex-priest." He may become a renegade priest, an anti-Catholic priest, a priest-hating priest, or any other stamp of priest; but he remains a priest, all the same, and all the "exs" that he could write in a year before his name would not make him less a priest. It seems to us that this should be the most fearful thought that could haunt the soul of the unworthy priest.

But in the case of a priest of the Church of Rome, provided he be a really ordained priest, there can be no "ex" applicable. He may leave the Church, he may attack the Church, he may abandon all the rights and privileges of priesthood, he may despise the functions of that high office, but he cannot cease to be a priest, he cannot divest himself of the sacerdotal state, he cannot efface the effects of ordination. Therefore, it is morally and actually impossible for a genuine priest to become an "ex-priest." He may become a renegade priest, an anti-Catholic priest, a priest-hating priest, or any other stamp of priest; but he remains a priest, all the same, and all the "exs" that he could write in a year before his name would not make him less a priest. It seems to us that this should be the most fearful thought that could haunt the soul of the unworthy priest.

But in the case of a priest of the Church of Rome, provided he be a really ordained priest, there can be no "ex" applicable. He may leave the Church, he may attack the Church, he may abandon all the rights and privileges of priesthood, he may despise the functions of that high office, but he cannot cease to be a priest, he cannot divest himself of the sacerdotal state, he cannot efface the effects of ordination. Therefore, it is morally and actually impossible for a genuine priest to become an "ex-priest." He may become a renegade priest, an anti-Catholic priest, a priest-hating priest, or any other stamp of priest; but he remains a priest, all the same, and all the "exs" that he could write in a year before his name would not make him less a priest. It seems to us that this should be the most fearful thought that could haunt the soul of the unworthy priest.

But in the case of a priest of the Church of Rome, provided he be a really ordained priest, there can be no "ex" applicable. He may leave the Church, he may attack the Church, he may abandon all the rights and privileges of priesthood, he may despise the functions of that high office, but he cannot cease to be a priest, he cannot divest himself of the sacerdotal state, he cannot efface the effects of ordination. Therefore, it is morally and actually impossible for a genuine priest to become an "ex-priest." He may become a renegade priest, an anti-Catholic priest, a priest-hating priest, or any other stamp of priest; but he remains a priest, all the same, and all the "exs" that he could write in a year before his name would not make him less a priest. It seems to us that this should be the most fearful thought that could haunt the soul of the unworthy priest.

But in the case of a priest of the Church of Rome, provided he be a really ordained priest, there can be no "ex" applicable. He may leave the Church, he may attack the Church, he may abandon all the rights and privileges of priesthood, he may despise the functions of that high office, but he cannot cease to be a priest, he cannot divest himself of the sacerdotal state, he cannot efface the effects of ordination. Therefore, it is morally and actually impossible for a genuine priest to become an "ex-priest." He may become a renegade priest, an anti-Catholic priest, a priest-hating priest, or any other stamp of priest; but he remains a priest, all the same, and all the "exs" that he could write in a year before his name would not make him less a priest. It seems to us that this should be the most fearful thought that could haunt the soul of the unworthy priest.

question is no longer a governor, a mayor, a lawyer, or a member of Parliament, and this also includes the statement that such person has no longer the right, or power to exercise the functions peculiar to the state, office, or profession indicated. In the same sense there may be "ex-monks," "ex-nuns," and "ex-Catholics." That is to say, a person who once belonged to a religious order—male or female—even as a person who once belonged to the Catholic Church, may of free will abandon that state, or that faith, and go abroad in the world with the right to the prefix of "ex."

But in the case of a priest of the Church of Rome, provided he be a really ordained priest, there can be no "ex" applicable. He may leave the Church, he may attack the Church, he may abandon all the rights and privileges of priesthood, he may despise the functions of that high office, but he cannot cease to be a priest, he cannot divest himself of the sacerdotal state, he cannot efface the effects of ordination. Therefore, it is morally and actually impossible for a genuine priest to become an "ex-priest." He may become a renegade priest, an anti-Catholic priest, a priest-hating priest, or any other stamp of priest; but he remains a priest, all the same, and all the "exs" that he could write in a year before his name would not make him less a priest. It seems to us that this should be the most fearful thought that could haunt the soul of the unworthy priest.

But in the case of a priest of the Church of Rome, provided he be a really ordained priest, there can be no "ex" applicable. He may leave the Church, he may attack the Church, he may abandon all the rights and privileges of priesthood, he may despise the functions of that high office, but he cannot cease to be a priest, he cannot divest himself of the sacerdotal state, he cannot efface the effects of ordination. Therefore, it is morally and actually impossible for a genuine priest to become an "ex-priest." He may become a renegade priest, an anti-Catholic priest, a priest-hating priest, or any other stamp of priest; but he remains a priest, all the same, and all the "exs" that he could write in a year before his name would not make him less a priest. It seems to us that this should be the most fearful thought that could haunt the soul of the unworthy priest.

But in the case of a priest of the Church of Rome, provided he be a really ordained priest, there can be no "ex" applicable. He may leave the Church, he may attack the Church, he may abandon all the rights and privileges of priesthood, he may despise the functions of that high office, but he cannot cease to be a priest, he cannot divest himself of the sacerdotal state, he cannot efface the effects of ordination. Therefore, it is morally and actually impossible for a genuine priest to become an "ex-priest." He may become a renegade priest, an anti-Catholic priest, a priest-hating priest, or any other stamp of priest; but he remains a priest, all the same, and all the "exs" that he could write in a year before his name would not make him less a priest. It seems to us that this should be the most fearful thought that could haunt the soul of the unworthy priest.

But in the case of a priest of the Church of Rome, provided he be a really ordained priest, there can be no "ex" applicable. He may leave the Church, he may attack the Church, he may abandon all the rights and privileges of priesthood, he may despise the functions of that high office, but he cannot cease to be a priest, he cannot divest himself of the sacerdotal state, he cannot efface the effects of ordination. Therefore, it is morally and actually impossible for a genuine priest to become an "ex-priest." He may become a renegade priest, an anti-Catholic priest, a priest-hating priest, or any other stamp of priest; but he remains a priest, all the same, and all the "exs" that he could write in a year before his name would not make him less a priest. It seems to us that this should be the most fearful thought that could haunt the soul of the unworthy priest.

But in the case of a priest of the Church of Rome, provided he be a really ordained priest, there can be no "ex" applicable. He may leave the Church, he may attack the Church, he may abandon all the rights and privileges of priesthood, he may despise the functions of that high office, but he cannot cease to be a priest, he cannot divest himself of the sacerdotal state, he cannot efface the effects of ordination. Therefore, it is morally and actually impossible for a genuine priest to become an "ex-priest." He may become a renegade priest, an anti-Catholic priest, a priest-hating priest, or any other stamp of priest; but he remains a priest, all the same, and all the "exs" that he could write in a year before his name would not make him less a priest. It seems to us that this should be the most fearful thought that could haunt the soul of the unworthy priest.

But in the case of a priest of the Church of Rome, provided he be a really ordained priest, there can be no "ex" applicable. He may leave the Church, he may attack the Church, he may abandon all the rights and privileges of priesthood, he may despise the functions of that high office, but he cannot cease to be a priest, he cannot divest himself of the sacerdotal state, he cannot efface the effects of ordination. Therefore, it is morally and actually impossible for a genuine priest to become an "ex-priest." He may become a renegade priest, an anti-Catholic priest, a priest-hating priest, or any other stamp of priest; but he remains a priest, all the same, and all the "exs" that he could write in a year before his name would not make him less a priest. It seems to us that this should be the most fearful thought that could haunt the soul of the unworthy priest.

But in the case of a priest of the Church of Rome, provided he be a really ordained priest, there can be no "ex" applicable. He may leave the Church, he may attack the Church, he may abandon all the rights and privileges of priesthood, he may despise the functions of that high office, but he cannot cease to be a priest, he cannot divest himself of the sacerdotal state, he cannot efface the effects of