

employment of Bavarians on this front indicates that hard fighting is expected in the mountains. The Bavarians, who have plenty of mountain-climbing to do at home, are almost invariably sent to the front when a piece of work like the forcing of the Predel Pass is in hand.

The public appeal of the King of Roumania to the Allies asking that they aid in preventing the Germans from doing to his country what they did to Belgium and Serbia will lead the Russians to strain every nerve to reinforce the Roumanian army. The Slav troops thrown into the Dobruja from Bessarabia saved the situation there and forced von Mackensen to give up his project of crossing the Danube and attacking Roumania from the south. If the Roumanians can hold the Transylvanian Passes a few days longer the Russians will be able to come up in sufficient force to block them permanently. The sudden cessation of the Russian forward movement in southern Galicia and in the wooded Carpathians undoubtedly means the withdrawal of a considerable part of Brusiloff's troops for operations in Roumania. They will be heard from in a few days on that front.

ITALY HELPING

Meanwhile Italy is doing everything possible to compel reinforcement of the Austrian army on the Isonzo, thus weakening her offensive power in Transylvania. Since the renewal of the Italian offensive on the Carso plateau on Tuesday it is believed that the Austrian losses in killed and wounded have been at least 15,000, while over 9,000 prisoners have been taken, including 400 reported yesterday.

THE BULGARIAN FRONT

The Bulgars hold in force the railway on the Struma front both north and south of the point at Prosenik where the British have cut the line. A general advance as a means of aiding Roumania by diverting Bulgarian troops to the Saloniki front is almost certain to take place within a few days. King Constantine has been disposed of. He may not be more friendly than he was, but he is impotent now to harm the Allies. Constantine's latest pronouncement was made a day or two ago to a number of leading Greeks and others who asked him to join the Allies. He declared that in fifteen days Roumania would no longer exist, and that after she had been disposed of if Greece were to join the Allies now the irresistible German army would be turned loose on her. A couple of weeks will show whether Constantine is a prophet or a scare-monger.—Globe, Oct. 14.

T. P. O'CONNOR'S LETTER

AN IRISH SESSION

TO GO WITH CLEAN HANDS INTO A PEACE CONFERENCE ENGLAND MUST FREE IRELAND

Special Cable to the CATHOLIC RECORD (Copyright 1916 Central News)

London, Oct. 14th.—This is going to be largely an Irish session of Parliament. John Redmond will begin his offensive at the earliest possible moment. The whole ghastly incredible story of mismanagement of the British government in Ireland which first created a futile rebellion and then turned the country from almost universal hostility to some sympathy for the executed leaders will be told for the first time, and when it is told there will be an end to the futile, dishonest cry for conscription in Ireland.

Indeed, outside the newspaper offices and die-hard circles that cry has no reality. John Redmond, in the meantime, begins the session in a very different position from which he found himself at the end of the last session. His speech at Waterford marked the beginning of a complete turn of the tide and Irish members returning to London report a gradual, but nevertheless certain restoration of the authority of the Irish Party and its leader. However, anti-Ministerial feelings run high as ever. The remarkable outstanding contrast between the attitude of English opinion towards Ireland in the present epoch of the war is that Ireland is beginning to be understood and instead of crass ignorance and blind hate, understanding and sympathy are expressed in most English circles.

This new attitude means that although there is certainly strong anti-Irish feeling, especially where laborers have come to English works, thinking men in high political positions realize that Ireland cannot be expected to fight for liberty and the principle of nationality in Europe when she denied recognition herself. Just how far, and when this feeling will assert itself in definite proposals, is difficult to say. All Ireland is now too hostile to everything English to allow any Irish leader to even look in that direction. Other negotiations and settlements along the Lloyd George lines are dead, but there is no knowing what may take place in the midst of the present cataclysm and the sentiment is growing in England that before England can go into a peace conference with clean hands, she must have reconciled by liberation her sister Isle.

What personalities will come out of the welter and the eclipse of this war time? It is

quite impossible to say as yet. Except Mr. Asquith and Mr. Lloyd George, no man of the old or the young generation has added anything to his former position; indeed many, if not most of them, have rather receded than advanced. A Coalition Ministry, has had, like all big changes in political life, many unexpected by-products. It did not add to, but diminished, the hold of many party leaders on their old friends. Instead of gaining strength by combination, some of the parties seemed to have lost both cohesion and spirit. There are, especially in the Tory ranks, many good old partisans who think that the old Toryism is dying, and if the war goes on will soon be dead altogether.

This is perhaps partly the reason why Mr. Bonar Law is known to be less powerful with some of his own party than he was before the war. It is not that the war has not given him an opportunity of displaying very remarkable Parliamentary powers. Mr. Asquith, partly from generosity and partly from calculation, has given his Tory lieutenant ample opportunities for distinguishing himself. It was Mr. Bonar Law and Mr. Walter Long who had the chief responsibility for carrying the Conscription Bill through the House of Commons. Again and again Mr. Bonar Law has been entrusted with the temporary leadership of the House in the absence of Mr. Asquith and Mr. Lloyd George. Again and again he has also had the duty of closing a critical debate for the Ministry. It is on occasions such as these that Mr. Bonar Law appears at his best. He has a great command of simple and appropriate language; he can turn a delicate situation with a dexterous phrase; he has a good and a conciliatory temper; he has, in short, never failed in such situations to say the right thing. But on the other hand, he has come over again into collision with the die-hards; he did so especially on the Irish question. During the negotiations, as is known, there was a meeting of the Tory Party at the Carlton Club; the proceedings were private, but as is usually the case, plenty heard plenty of what went on inside. It is known that the only speeches which excited any enthusiasm were those delivered by the Die-Hards, led on this occasion by Lord Hugh Cecil. The leaders talked sense, but then as Lloyd George is reported to have commented, sense is not always inspiring at a public meeting. Every biting attack on the policy of Mr. Bonar Law and his friends was received with rounds of cheers; to the speeches of Mr. Bonar Law and Mr. Balfour there was nothing better than a coldly attentive listening; and even that was not always respectful.

What was the inner meaning of this? Some people attribute it to something deeper than the mere difference of opinion on the Irish question; it was regarded as a revolt of the squires. With that class of Tory Mr. Bonar Law was necessarily never very popular; he was not of their social class nor religious opinion. He is the son of a Presbyterian clergyman; he has been a business man. The typical Tory is, of course, the squire; the man of acres and of ancient descent, and the devout member of the Anglican Church. Disraeli felt this so much that he made a marriage for money, and the first thing he did was to buy himself an estate in Buckinghamshire and to set up in a small way as a squire; and of course when he was taken as a child by Sam Rogers, the poet, from the tabernacle of Moses to the Christian Church, he was baptised in an Anglican faith. Mr. Balfour and the Salisbury family represent better than any other this large section of the old Tory Party.

This central fact of political life in England makes people look with some interest to Lord Robert Cecil, and there are several who regard him as predestined to succeed, sometime or other, his father as the leader of the old country Party. He has done extremely well as a Minister since the Coalition. He has been broad, pleasant, is energetic and capable, and nobody has a word to say against his administration. Unlike his brother Lord Hugh, he has no great gift of eloquence; but also unlike his brother, he is a great man of the world; he can put his case with simplicity and force, and he has all the dexterity of a man who practised several years at the bar, in taking full advantage of the orders and rules of the House of Commons. It need scarcely be said that he is not an attached member of the Anglican Church, and of course belongs by generations and indeed centuries to the old squararchal class.

Mr. Austin Chamberlain has not been seen much in the House of Commons since the Coalition. As Secretary of State for India, he has a very big and a very difficult job, and he can find little time for work outside it. The Secretaryship for India, although it is perhaps next to the Foreign Office the most difficult and the most momentous office in the Government of the British Empire, has never been helpful to the advancement of a British politician. Yet if one reflect on the single fact that the Indian Secretary has the main responsibility for the government of three hundred millions of people, that these millions belong to widely different and sometimes conflicting creeds and races—that it is a country of a great deal of unrest, with the coming of the new generation which is knocking at the door of the old despotic system—if one

reflect on these facts, it will be evident that the man who has such a job has more important decisions to take every day than almost any other member of a Ministry.

But here comes in the peculiarity of life in the British House of Commons. To succeed there, one must always be in evidence in the House. It is not the importance of the work in itself that he does which counts; it is rather the manner and form of the work. If he is in a department which comes often before the House and thus has to be constantly on his feet, he in the first place becomes a much better speaker than those who have less practice. For after many years experience of speech making, I am certain that there are few arts of life which are more improved by constant practice than speaking in a legislative chamber. Richard Cobden, the great Free Trade Leader, felt this so much that for some years after he entered the House he made it a rule to speak almost every night. I have seen Gladstone with all his long training and his marvellous gifts become a better speaker every day that a parliamentary session lasted. When Mr. Lloyd George first entered the House of Commons he had no great liking for the place; he thought he would be always a failure there, for he was a platform prophet, as he thought then, not a man who could pick his way in the atmosphere of intrigue and compromise and over the barbed wire of rules; and for some sessions he did not speak frequently. Probably he might have become one of those members who remain silent until they lose the nerve to speak I have seen many brilliant Parliamentary careers end on that rock—if it had not been that the old uncle who has been more than a father to him did not write to him every day, and every day gently suggested that he was disappointed in not seeing his name more frequently in the debates. It was not till a Bill came before the House, the details of which Mr. Lloyd George knew from his experience as a young apprentice in a solicitor's office, that he began to speak frequently; and that was the beginning of his greatness as a Parliamentary speaker.

The India Office rarely comes up for debate in the House of Commons. Indeed nothing can demonstrate more conspicuously how little the so-called Imperial Parliament of the British Empire is so ridiculously un-Imperial as its treatment of the Indian Empire. It is only in the hot afternoons of July that the Indian Budget is ever heard of, and then very few members are present—only those ex-officials who have served a term in India, and who usually are ineffective in their new surroundings. This session we have not had even the July afternoon; we have only heard of India when we had to discuss the breakdown in the Mesopotamian force, for which the Indian Government had to bear part of the responsibility.

Thus, then, the man who is appointed Secretary for India practically is removed from the House of Commons during the time he holds this office. The same is true of the Foreign Secretary. During the many years he was Foreign Secretary, Viscount Grey became almost as unknown to the general body of the House of Commons as the silent member who never opens his lips. Even when he had to come there for a division he rushed through the division lobby as if it were a "plague spot"—as I once heard a Radical bitterly say. Yet there were few men in the House who had so great a command of its ear; no man proved so unanswerable, so potent, on the great occasions when he did speak. He was probably the only man who could have carried the House of Commons with him on the fateful afternoon when he practically made the Declaration of war against Germany. But during many years he made no progress in the House of Commons, for the reason that he became unknown and unfamiliar to it.

If lucky accident, on the other hand, had made Viscount Grey leader of the House, he would have developed his great abilities, and no man probably would have exceeded him in that position except Mr. Asquith, whose command of appropriate language is uncanny. Similarly, Mr. Lloyd George, as deputy leader of the House and as the centre of great legislative storms, has gradually attained the ascendancy he now exercises in Parliamentary politics. Similarly, Mr. Bonar Law has had his chance and has benefited by it. But they alone have been in the Parliamentary limelight, and though the Foreign Office and the India Office are such great departments, they have proved again, as so often before, that they are a living tomb for the Parliamentarian who wants to reach to the mastery of the opinion and the debates of the House of Commons.

This brief survey of the present position and the future prospects of the leading personalities of the House of Commons leaves the future of most of them in obscurity. Probably Mr. Asquith will have had enough after the war, if his Premier ship survive to that period. Some other Ministers will also have had enough by that time. But after all, nobody can speculate on the future of any of them with confidence, for no man can tell what the new conditions of social and political life in England will be after the war. We are certain to face an entirely new England as an entire new world, and it is conditions, more than their own gifts, that make or mar the fortunes

of all politicians. When the contingencies are all discussed and all exhausted, there enters that final factor in the life of such a gambler as every politician is bound to be; and that decisive factor is the great god Chance.

ROUMANIA HAS FEW CATHOLICS

80,000 IN REALM

With the entrance of Roumania into the war it is not without interest to survey briefly the situation of Catholicism in the kingdom on the Danube. Almost all the population of the country, which amounts to about five and a half millions, belong to the national Orthodox Church. Catholics number no more than 70,000 or 80,000, and are organized into two Catholic sees, an archbishopric at Bukarest and a bishopric at Jassy. The present Metropolitan is Mgr. Netzhammer, a Swiss Benedictine, who was born at Freiburg in Germany. The ancient Catholic Church in the country disappeared when the people, acting under the influence of the Bulgars, put themselves under the Greek Church in the ninth century. A small remnant of faithful remained, and these, in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, received acquisitions by immigration. During the Middle Ages most of the spiritual work of this little flock was done by members of religious orders. In the nineteenth century Rome reorganized its government by separating Roumania from the see of Nicopolis in 1883, when Ignatius Paoli was appointed first Archbishop of Bukarest, and by re-establishing the exempt diocese of Jassy as suffragan to the metropolitan see. The priests in the archdiocese number at present about half a hundred, and there are some forty-five churches, twenty-three of which are parish churches. So far the government seem to have opposed the opening of a diocesan seminary, but this opposition has not extended to the establishment of Catholic parochial schools. In Bukarest alone the Brothers of the Christian Schools have three, and others kept by members of other religious congregations. French Catholicism is well represented amongst this Latin nation by the Passionist Fathers, the Sisters of Charity, the Ladies of Zion, and the Oblate Sisters of the Assumption. The Sisters of Charity have a hospital in the capital. The Ladies of Zion have five schools at Bukarest, Jassy and Galatz, which number among their pupils many girls belonging to the National Church. Schools have also been opened by the Oblate Sisters of the Assumption, and the tact of the nuns in dealing with the religion of their non-Catholic girls is widely acknowledged, whilst the characteristic work carried out by the Sisters of Charity has rendered them as popular in Roumania as elsewhere.

When all is said, however, the Catholic community in Roumania is a small one. But, small as it is, it is satisfactory to be able to add that, generally speaking, it receives fair and even benevolent treatment at the hands of the government. This is doubtless due in no small measure to the fact that the late King Carol was a Catholic, as is also the present ruler, King Ferdinand. So far those good relations have been opened and maintained without recourse to any formal convention between the State and the Vatican authorities. They are therefore dependent on the personal good will and sense of justice of the powers that be. Why no Concordat has been concluded between Roumania and the Holy See is not quite clear. It may not have been considered necessary; it does not seem to be due to any strong feeling against such an agreement on the part of Roumanian statesmen. Many, indeed, have gone so far as to express themselves in favor of the conclusion of such an agreement, and of the establishment of diplomatic relations with the Vatican. It is at least certain that the negotiations between Serbia and the Holy See, which resulted in the conclusion of a Concordat at the time of the outbreak of the war, were followed with no small interest by men prominent in the conduct of Roumanian affairs. That Concordat was largely due to the necessity under which Serbia found herself, as a result of the Balkan War of 1912, of giving a legal position to the Catholic communities in the vilayets of Uskub and Monastir which had fallen into her possession. In the present conflict into which she has thrown herself, Roumania may find herself under a similar necessity. Should the fortune of war enable her to realize her national aspirations by bringing within her rule the large body of Catholic Uniates of her race in Transylvania, she may find it, if not absolutely necessary, at least convenient and politic, to consider the question of entering into direct diplomatic relations with Rome for the regulation of their position and its future maintenance by a Concordat. Indeed, a French correspondent has been assured by a high diplomatic personage who had a considerable part in bringing about Roumanian intervention that a Concordat would follow. At the same time many representative members of Roumanian Catholics, like Prince Vladimir Ghika are described as friendly to French influence, whilst the Archbishop is well known for the jealous care with which he guards the integrity of the faith of his people. But with a friendly Court and at least an absence of hostility on the part of Roumanian

statesmen, there should seem to be reason to believe that the prospects of the future are already encouraging, and would be assured if the million and a half of Roumanian Catholic Uniates in Transylvania should, by the fortune of war, be re-united with their brethren east of the Carpathians.—New World.

THE CHURCH'S SOCIAL PROGRAM

It is just twenty-five years since Pope Leo XIII. sent out to the Christian world his famous Encyclical letter on the condition of the working man in contemporary society. This document, which was far and away the most important issued during the entire century, has won for the great pontiff a loving remembrance in the heart and mind of the working man. It has earned for him the enviable title, "the Pope of the Working-men." It has done more to introduce into society true views, honest views, with regard to labor and capital, than any other pronouncement of man for centuries.

And the reason of it all is this: Pope Leo XIII., spoke not his own words, but the words of the Divine Friend of the poor, who lived and toiled in Nazareth nineteen hundred years ago. The Pope's Encyclical was nothing more than a re-statement in modern language of the teachings of the Gospel. The "Rerum novarum," as the Pope's letter was called, is a digest of the teaching of Catholic theologians from the beginning.

The Pope looked the situation squarely in the face. He did not play off the laborer against his employer, or vice versa. He wrote the letter in order to compose the situation, and this could only be done by stating matters truthfully, honestly and candidly, pointing out abuses where they existed, prescribing remedies where these were feasible, seeking to nurture and foster seeds of righteousness and justice wherever they were to be found. It is for this reason that we find in the Pope's letter descriptions of social conditions which in their gruesome fidelity to the truth might have emanated from the most deep-seated Socialist. No wonder that the Socialists tried to make out that Pope Leo XIII. was the high priest of Socialism. If the Sovereign Pontiff had anything in common with the Socialist, it was only a sharp insight into the social inequalities of the times and an iron determination to hold them up to universal reprobation.

The Pope's letter is constructive throughout. It goes on the assumption that there is still reigning above a God whose free creatures we are. Since labor was imposed upon man in paradise as a medicinal remedy, it is a right to possess those things which he has won honestly in the sweat of his brow. The laws of God are laws of justice, giving to each man that which is his right. As soon, then, as the divine law is interfered with social complications must result. As soon as religion is cut out of the heart of man, the passion for possession, the concupiscence of the eye, must grow apace. Therefore, it is only through religion that society can really be saved. Only God can make men love one another and respect one another.

It would be well for every Catholic to procure a copy of the Pope's unsurpassed letter on the social condition of the working-man. The mutual rights and obligations of employer and employees have never been stated in clearer, more unmistakable terms. It is a real social Magna Charta. It is a tangible proof of the persistent interest of the Church, not only in the spiritual but in the temporal welfare of society. It is a guarantee of the continuance of the Master's spirit of commiseration for the multitude in the Church.—The Rosary Magazine.

ARCHBISHOP GLENNON

DECLARES THERE MUST BE SOME LIMITATIONS TO THE GROWING POWER OF THE STATE

The Most Rev. John J. Glennon, D. D., Archbishop of St. Louis, sounded a needed warning on a recent Sunday when he declared in the course of a sermon in his Cathedral that there must be limitations to the growing power of the State. Archbishop Glennon declared that "the tendency of today all over the world is for the State to grow more and more; while the individual is becoming less and less. It was the pride and purpose of the last century to promote and foster a healthy individualism—to speak of individual rights, of his duties—to yield to the State just what was necessary for its existence. Property should be protected—the rights of the individual protected—a maximum of personal liberty, and a minimum of legal limitation.

"There are many now who think this gospel of individualism is a failure. It has led to disorganization—national weakness—state inefficiency. It has given occasion to the exploitation of one individual or a group of individuals by another individual or a group thereof. The State lacking power at home lacked influence abroad; and in its weakness became an inviting prey to State with centralized power and resources at its disposal.

The present disastrous war in Europe has done much to accentuate these things. Some nations were

organized, disciplined, prepared, their railroads were built, and controlled by the government, their men were trained to be soldiers, the science both of war and peace was passionately studied. And those nations that lagged behind in their organization, in the directive power of the State, soon found out that they were doomed; unless, they, too, would come together, unless their governments would absorb, take over, utilize the resources at their disposal, compel men to enlist and people to sacrifice their substance, and yield up their property, and further, still, their lives.

"Until today we find that among the belligerent nations the individual who can fight is compelled to do so; the one who cannot, must work for the fighting man; and the whole nation must go out at the bidding of its rulers to fight for an idea, or to repel a people who have an idea, or a method that they do not like.

"With us it has not gone so far. We have not reached the conscription point yet; nor compulsory military service; nor the government ownership of railroads or telegraph or food supplies or land, or industry; but we are moving in that direction. Recent legislation is a move in evidence, and much of the legislation of the last few years has a similar trend.

"Nor am I criticising this tendency. The truth is, the times have changed. The grouping of capital into trusts and monopolies on the one hand, and of laboring men into unions on the other, results in clashes and outbreaks. Where are they to go for protection—for the adjudication of their claims? The State must intervene; and intervention means always the assertion of a new authority—the opening of a new field of activity.

"But there must be limitations to the growing power of the State. Otherwise, what commences as a democracy may become the worst, and most pestiferous of tyrannies. It may become so, even retaining through it all the form and name of a Republic. And first of all, a secular State may not seek to legislate for, nor claim jurisdiction over the soul. It may not create, nor teach religion. It may not coerce conscience. Under a free government religion also must be free.

"In the field of education the State may supervise, assist, promote and protect. It may demand that its coming citizens shall receive the knowledge necessary unto good citizenship. But, it is not obligated to train and produce for the community lawyers, doctors, preachers or scientists at the cost of the taxpayers.

"The Catholic school, created at the expense, not of the taxpayers, but by the voluntary subscriptions, undertakes to teach its pupils a knowledge of God, and a willing obedience to His laws—a knowledge of our country—a profound, loyal and immediate support of our government. It would build up the individual conscience, the moral law, the duties and rights of citizenship. As such it has a right to the protection of the State that it so wholeheartedly defends for the community whose best interest it promotes.

"Some say a school in this very practical age is just a place where boys and girls may learn how to make a living. Well, my friends, even according to this very low criterion, the Catholic schools (as examinations ever show), are the most thorough in their training, in the exact sciences, in the fitting the youth for a business or professional career.

"But even if this were not so, I take it as far more important for a school to teach the youth 'how to live,' rather than merely 'how to make a living.' I think it is all important that the youth should have a conscience, and follow its dictates—should be trained in the moral law—should feel and recognize his responsibility to God, his Father and Judge. Without these, the boy may make a living for a while; but he will not make it long. He necessarily fails, because his life and work are without meaning, sanction or support. The lure of gold may lure him on; and he who follows may be successful, but only as a slave.—Providence Visor.

WHAT ONE MAN FOUND OUT

An estimable gentleman, a clergyman, who went abroad with the Ford Peace (?) Expedition, returned to America a sadder but much wiser man. The Reverend Dr. Aked declares that he learned what he knew before, only better, that "the business of a preacher of the gospel is—to preach the gospel."

It would be well if others were to profit by Dr. Aked's words of wisdom. The world may be prodigiously impressed by the gymnasium and lunch-room brand of religion to which some of our non-Catholic brethren have been giving themselves for a decade or so past; impressed with it as an example of material

achievement and businesslike efficiency, but the world will not, because of it, be brought nearer to Christianity.

Unless we are greatly mistaken, a reaction is setting in. All signs point to it, not the least among which is the recovered conviction of the man in the street that, to quote Dr. Aked once more, "the business of a preacher of the gospel is—to preach the gospel."—New World.

THE SCEPTIC

The sceptic sneers away his very soul,
And binds in many folds a bandage tight
About his eyes, lest a beam of light
Might by some chance creep through;
And then the dole

Of fame and lucre which is his might roll
From his weak grasp. Alas, when every night
And day, nay, every moment, is bedight
With God's own presence, that a fool should toil

The jangling bells of discord, and awake
In trusting minds a sad inquietude:
Should wreck a simple faith and ruthless break
A life of happiness. Base servitude
To earthly fame! He would dethrone his God

To gain from fortune but a scornful nod.
—MICHAEL J. SHEA, in Notre Dame Scholastic.

"FIVE MINUTES BEFORE MASS"

"In most instances," says the Catholic Citizen, "there is absolutely no excuse for coming late to church. People are not hurried or pressed by other affairs on Sunday. If they reach the church five or ten minutes after the services have begun it is wholly because of an unreasonable fear of spending too much time in the house of God. Else, why the studious care which people take of leaving the house only with sufficient margin of time to reach the church? Why do they display so much precaution that they be too early? They are not gingerly about coming some minutes before the play begins' at places of amusements. They waste ten times the time thus 'lost' otherwise during the day. But is the time that a Christian spends in church just before the services begin really 'lost'? The expected answer is: by no means. A sterling Catholic has expressed the opinion that five minutes' reflection and self-communion, before the priest comes to the altar is productive of the best spiritual results. A practice of reaching the church five minutes before the services have begun and of spending the time in strictly religious reflection—powerfully assisted by the associations of the place—has always prepared an excellent disposition for assisting at the sacred ceremony that follows."

You must use a bit to make a safe horse, a safe man, and a safe artist.
—"Keystones of Thought,"

FATHER FRASER'S CHINESE MISSION

Taichowfu, China, Dec. 11, 1916.

Dear Readers of CATHOLIC RECORD: It may be a little surprise to you to learn that it takes \$100 a week to keep my mission going. I am glad when I see that amount contributed in the RECORD, but when it is less I am sad to see my little reserve fund diminished and the catastrophe arriving when I must close my chapels, discharge my catechists and reduce my expenses to the few dollars coming in weekly. I beseech you to make one more supreme effort during 1916 to keep this mission on its feet. You will be surprised to learn what a great deal I am doing with \$100 a week—keeping myself and curate, 30 catechists, 7 chapels, and free schools, 8 churches in different cities with caretakers supporting two big catechumens of men, women and children during their preparation for baptism and building a church every year.

Yours gratefully in Jesus and Mary.
J. M. FRASER.

Previously acknowledged...	\$7,948 25
A friend, Judique.....	25
A Thanksgiving.....	1 00
A friend, Chepstow.....	1 00
A friend, Summerstown Station.....	1 00
Loretto Reader.....	5 00
M. J. O'Leary, London.....	2 00
In honor of Our Lady.....	2 00
A friend, Fitzroy Harbor.....	5 00
T. White, Charlottetown.....	1 00
A friend, New Waterford.....	1 00
J. A. McGregor, Appleton.....	2 00
C. Dwyer, St. John's.....	5 00

Merchants' Bank of Canada

ESTABLISHED 1864

Paid-up Capital \$7,000,000
Reserve Fund and Undivided Profits 7,250,984

GENERAL BANKING BUSINESS

206 Branches and Agencies in Canada

Savings Department at All Branches

Deposits Received and Interest Allowed at Best Current Rates
Bankers to the Grey Nuns, Montreal; St. Augustine's Seminary, St. Joseph's Academy, and St. Michael's Hospital, Toronto.