

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

THOS. COFFEY, L.L.D., Editor and Publisher

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Ogdensburg, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Subscribers changing residences will please give old as well as new address.

Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form.

Letters of Recommendation.

Mr. Thomas Coffey:

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

These lines it has done a great deal of good for the welfare of religion and country, and it will do more and more, as its wholesome influence reaches more and more hearts.

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

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

Mr. Thomas Coffey:

Dear Sir—For some time past I have read your estimable paper, THE CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

It is both good and true, and its influence pervades the whole. Therefore, with pleasure, I can recommend it to the faithful.

Blessing you and wishing you success, believe me to remain,

Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ, J. D. FALCONIO, Arch. of Larissa, Apost. Deleat.

LONDON, SATURDAY, OCT. 19, 1907.

CALUMNIATING HIS MOTHER.

A man descends low enough when, casting away the frock of his priesthood, he passes out through the gates of the sanctuary, and too frequently out through the doors of the Church itself.

Did he stop here, did he even find in the poisoned wells of heresy the waters of life we might pity him most deeply for his mistaken judgment and dangerous loss.

Too often these unfortunates go farther. Not satisfied with leaving the Church, they turn against it. At the bid of their new masters they stoop to gather and hurl it at the walls which too gently sheltered them.

They do what any meanly hearted man would do; they backbite and calumniate their mother. The language they utter they know to be false; and the impression they strive to make is to render prejudice deeper engraved in their hearers' minds.

This is evident from their methods. They seek districts where Catholicity is hardly known, where contradiction is unlikely and where returns may be expected to reward them for their foul unnatural work.

The latest example of these unfortunates is one Fournier, of whom, upon writing to Lower Canada for information, we were told that, intellectually as well as otherwise, he was unworthy of attention.

Perhaps so—but still what are we to think of a man who likens Catholicity to Buddhism? Is he a knave, or is he a fool? Fournier lectured the other night at Meaford, where, as the report tells us, this ex-priest "in a forceful discourse reviewed the work of the Protestant missions in the Province of Quebec."

A correspondent sent us a clipping containing this report, with a request that for the sake of our co-religionists, we should answer this man's statements. It is with reluctance we touch him; he is a foul slanderer, a weakling, to whose dreamy, incoherent, untrue arguments no attention should be paid.

He is here and there; and if it is not Fournier it is Margaret L. Shepard, and if it is not she it is some other ex-priest or ex-nun. They are not many when we compare their number with the number of devoted men and women who render their vows to the Lord by their sanctified lives of prayer and work.

We repeat that these disreputables are not many; but we admit that they are noisy and irritating. They deserve notice, not on account of their own importance or the injury they really do to the Church, but on account of our scattered people whose social relations rather than their faith may be disturbed.

But we have another letter which bears upon our subject, from the ex-priest himself. In it he maintains he uses no bitter words. He is not, however, ashamed to claim that the Catholics were once Baptists "in belief and practice."

He exhorts us thus: "We will never go to you, but come back to the fold, the primitive Church, as we find it decided in the New Testament." In the lecture at Meaford this ex-priest assumes a different tone. Catholicism there he proclaimed to be virtual Buddhism.

He pretends not to use any bitter language towards Catholics. He may not use abusive language. But if anything can be more bitter than to be calumniated, spoken ill of, charged with things of which you are innocent, we should like to know what it is.

He says our people are not allowed to read the Bible. He knows that that is false. His boast is that in Montreal, a city of 300,000, there are eight Protestant

French Canadian churches. And these have been over seventy years trying to attain that number. Let the Grande Ligne persevere, and let the dupes of Ontario continue to pay out their money. In a hundred years hence they may have twenty such churches.

The Meaford Mirror says that this man is "the son of a Catholic high up in the Church of Rome." This is a very misleading statement. What is, or may have been, the social standing of this man's father, we know not, but his rank in the Church was that of any other layman.

This ex-priest is cowardly in that he pretends to have taken scandal at the conduct of others of the clergy. In his exalted virtue he could not bear their irreligious tone and manner. He never says "bitter" things of others; not he. Yet he brands a whole class with the charge that they are acting a part. Where is the hypocrisy? He decided "to have nothing to do with religion at all."

He should have stuck to this; and if he had he would not be going around the country taking money for the purpose of buying his fellow French Canadians to deny their God. And notwithstanding this statement he poses as a Baptist, is flattered by them, and exhorts us to join him. No, thanks. We are quite satisfied with dear old Mother Church, whose doctrine has been the light of life, whose worship has been our inheritance and riches, and whose saints are our models and intercessors before God.

We know countless numbers of her priests—and we protest against the hypocrisy impugned to them by this unworthy outcast. If all of them are not saints, by far the greatest majority are saintlike men, quietly, earnestly, successfully working in the kingdom for the building up of the Church of Christ. It would be better if the Baptists would have this ex-priest of theirs keep quiet; silence is more becoming a man of his standing, and his untruthful utterances do not serve religion or peace.

If Protestants want information about the Church they should, we think, seek it from a more reliable source. As for our co-religionists who find the visits of these tramp perverts irritating, they must not be so easily discouraged. It is no small thing that they have the faith which these unscrupulous characters have abandoned. These occasions afford them an opportunity of showing the beauty and excellence of the faith by the good example of their lives, and a readiness to defend and explain what is so insidiously attacked and so falsely malignd.

INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

In our last issue we pointed out the illogical position taken by Archbishop Sweatman, of Toronto, in dedicating a church to St. Cyprian and at the same time chiding Rome with adopting the doctrine of purgatory. We take up His Grace's second point, viz., invocation of saints. This the Anglican prelate claimed to be another ground on account of which Rome had forfeited her title to being the Church of Christ.

Two things are worthy of our attention. It seems to us most paradoxical that the Archbishop should be dedicating a church to St. Cyprian and should condemn Rome for invoking the saints, St. Cyprian amongst them. This new Anglican church bears the name of its patron. Compare that title with Sherburne Street Methodist or the Jarvis Street Baptist. These describe their locality. Surely St. Cyprian's title is of a different character. It is more than a mere name to distinguish it from the others of its class, which, strange as it may seem, nearly all bear saints' names. Unless the title be a mockery a church under the name of a saint is one of the practices of the invocation of the chosen servants of God.

Strangely unfortunate was His Grace in naming the new church St. Cyprian, for this Bishop and martyr is a witness for the doctrine which Archbishop Sweatman condemns in Rome. This brings us to the second point we had in view; the doctrine itself. Few points of doctrine are such a rich and increasing inheritance to the Church as the communion and intercession of the saints; for the Church, holy in its earliest ages in the apostles and martyrs, it still continues to produce generations of confessors and virgins rich in merit and virtue. It enters so fitly into the idea of Christianity that, as the Head is in heaven in the majesty of God, so do the saints reigning with Him show forth the triumph of His grace over the weakness of man and His mercy over all His works. Who can hold that the child snatched from the parent by death hath no interest in her and continues not to love her whom it left upon earth? Bright with the vision of God, and happy forever with the crown won and home gained, why will not that child raise its pure hands to God for those whom it loved here below? There is no reason on God's part that He should strip love of its highest prerogative when He has imparted it to it its most

earnest energy and bestowed upon it its richest crown. We have more assurance still. The angels have, so revelation assures us, charge over us. And when Tobias prayed with tears and buried the dead the archangel offered these prayers to the Lord. In the New Testament our Saviour says: "Even so, there shall be joy in heaven over one sinner that doth penance, more than over ninety-nine just that need not penance." We are minded thereby to avoid sin, to seek forgiveness, to practice virtue for the sake of the angels. All this, and much more, if we had space, shows the intercourse and communion between angels and men. St. John in Patmos saw before a mystical altar in heaven a blessed spirit stand, "having a golden censer, and there was given to him much incense, that he should offer the prayers of all saints upon the golden altar, which is before the throne of God. And the smoke of the incense of the prayers of the saints ascended up before God, from the hands of the angels." Thus the saints do more than merely know and interest themselves about us; they actually present our prayers to God, and intercede for us. This is likewise of universal tradition. The early Christians prayed to the martyrs to intercede for them. Many inscriptions are to be found in the catacombs, of which the following is an example: "Sabbatus, sweet soul, pray and entreat for thy brethren and comrades." The Fathers are equally clear. St. Irenaeus in the second century says, "that as Eve was seduced to fly from God, so was the Virgin Mary induced to obey Him; that she might become the advocate of her that had fallen." In the third century this very St. Cyprian to whom Archbishop Sweatman dedicates a new Anglican Church, writes: "Let us be mindful of one another in our prayers; with one mind and with one heart, in this world and in the next, let us always pray, with mutual charity relieving our sufferings and afflictions. And may the charity of him who, by the divine favor, shall first depart hence, still persevere before the Lord; may his prayers for our brethren and sisters not cease." Listen to another saint of this age, St. Ephrem, of the Oriental Church: "We fly to thy patronage, Holy Mother of God; protect and guard us under the wings of thy mercy and kindness. Most merciful God, through the intercession of the most Blessed Virgin Mary, and of all the angels and saints, show pity to thy creature." And St. Gregory of Nyssa thus addresses the same St. Ephrem after the latter's death: "Do thou now, being present at God's altar, and with His angels offering sacrifice to the Prince of life, and to the most Holy Trinity, remember us; begging for us the pardon of our sins." This doctrine was therefore evidently universal in the East and West, as it is universal in time. The voice of tradition is consistent. It has never varied through the centuries. Its lessons of intercessory prayer are of its only complete explanation of that "communion of saints" which Archbishop Sweatman recites and in which he professes belief. His Grace cannot maintain that the Roman Church has forfeited the title of being the "original" Church for the reason of its belief and practice of devotion to the saints.

Church was dead, his students would be in danger of attaching credence to it. Herein on both sides, from the irreligious tendency of the critical professor on the one hand and the readiness to accept his propositions, sugar coated as they are and concealed beneath the tastiest flavors of language as is their poison, beyond all other authority, parental or otherwise—herein is the evil of non Catholic education. But the assertion is so absurd that unless students be altogether weak-minded they would take it more as a joke than the serious conclusion of study or observation. The wish is often father to the thought; so might it be with young men listening to such talk. Never burthened with too much religion they would be glad of any excuse to justify their wanton disregard of the things of God. The Church dead! So was the Master dead—and His enemies gloated, rejoicing, that the seducer's career was at an end and that He would never be heard from more. So often has the world proclaimed the death of the Church that hardly a century has opened and closed without the same insane howl and the same false prophecy being shouted as an echo from the infernal regions. Roman imperialism, northern barbarism, Arian heresy, western schism, European defection, French revolution, broken treaties, secret associations, have all in turn battered at the walls of the new Jerusalem—but in vain. In vain have the nations raged and the Gentiles plotted against the Christ and His Church. We smile, and we can afford to smile, at this conceited professor's boast. There have been ages when intellectualism made an attack upon the Church which was felt. This is not, when comparing it with many of the Christian eras, a truly intellectual age. It has its own glories and advantages. These are of a lower class. The age is too materialistic and atheistic to be truly intellectual. In the modern quiver there is not an arrow straight enough to hit the mark; nor among the archers a bowman strong enough to bend the bow. Agnosticism, evolution, criticism, scepticism are all on the arena to try a shot. Their best exponents are gone, but the Church remains. They have taken the Bible, criticized its authors, its meaning and its characters. And the only guardian to stand by God's Word is the Church whose unflinching courage is equal to her unflinching confidence. Intellectualism in this respect assumes the role of destructive criticism. Herein is its weakness: for the normal condition of the human mind is truth, not relentless deadly criticism. Nor do we see the signs of approaching death. We are not pessimistic. With all the activity of the age and the rush for wealth and the sins of society we see our churches crowded with men of faith who give their heart to God and who share their goods with the poor. All have not bowed their knee to Baal, nor have any but the fool denied the existence of God. The Church no doubt is passing through a severe crisis. Visibly it is abandoned by the nations. It leans still more upon that invisible support of truth and God's Holy Spirit. The Pontiff's voice is strong and clear. It is listened to with deference by more than ever before. But even if the sky were dark and lowering, and the waves hard pressing upon the boat, faith does not falter. When things are at their worst God's might shows best and His mercy is brightest; so is it with the Church. Her long career has been one of almost uninterrupted struggle. Few and short her triumphs, she looks not for glory here, nor is her life to be measured by the standard of earthly kingdoms. Her work is not yet accomplished, her fight not over; she must continue her labors. The same power that started her nineteen hundred years ago will preserve her still in truth, and long after the little professor of Cornell has passed from the scene, and learned that there is much more than was ever dreamed of in his philosophy.

THE CHURCH IS DEAD.

"Who saw it die?
I saw it die."
"With my little eye
I saw it die."

The fly here alluded to is one Prof. Nathaniel Schmidt, who according to our esteemed contemporary, The Catholic Union and Times, has decided that the Church is dead. What a solemn decision! True the court is insignificant and the judge self-appointed. He is a so-called biblical scholar whose erudition has reached the danger point, and whose notoriety is gained more by the striking theories he advances than by the truths he explains. One of these is the desideratum of many—the death of the Church—and another is the credited statement: "No creed is good enough for acceptance except the 1907 creed." Now this little man's little eye for the most part looks out upon a certain number of students of Cornell University where he is professor. God help students who are under such a guide! Commentary is lost where the proposition lacks common sense. The Church dead, the creed of 1907 to replace it. The former is so preposterous that one wonders at any sane man expressing it even within the narrow confines of a class room. There it must prove more dangerous than if uttered in the market square of the world. Students are apt to take the teachings and sayings of their professors without salt. And even if a man, taking God's holy word and commenting upon, say the passage "I am with you all days to the consummation of the world," were to try and explain it away, telling his boys that all those things were over and done, the kingdom of Christ had passed away, the

Church was dead, his students would be in danger of attaching credence to it. Herein on both sides, from the irreligious tendency of the critical professor on the one hand and the readiness to accept his propositions, sugar coated as they are and concealed beneath the tastiest flavors of language as is their poison, beyond all other authority, parental or otherwise—herein is the evil of non Catholic education. But the assertion is so absurd that unless students be altogether weak-minded they would take it more as a joke than the serious conclusion of study or observation. The wish is often father to the thought; so might it be with young men listening to such talk. Never burthened with too much religion they would be glad of any excuse to justify their wanton disregard of the things of God. The Church dead! So was the Master dead—and His enemies gloated, rejoicing, that the seducer's career was at an end and that He would never be heard from more. So often has the world proclaimed the death of the Church that hardly a century has opened and closed without the same insane howl and the same false prophecy being shouted as an echo from the infernal regions. Roman imperialism, northern barbarism, Arian heresy, western schism, European defection, French revolution, broken treaties, secret associations, have all in turn battered at the walls of the new Jerusalem—but in vain. In vain have the nations raged and the Gentiles plotted against the Christ and His Church. We smile, and we can afford to smile, at this conceited professor's boast. There have been ages when intellectualism made an attack upon the Church which was felt. This is not, when comparing it with many of the Christian eras, a truly intellectual age. It has its own glories and advantages. These are of a lower class. The age is too materialistic and atheistic to be truly intellectual. In the modern quiver there is not an arrow straight enough to hit the mark; nor among the archers a bowman strong enough to bend the bow. Agnosticism, evolution, criticism, scepticism are all on the arena to try a shot. Their best exponents are gone, but the Church remains. They have taken the Bible, criticized its authors, its meaning and its characters. And the only guardian to stand by God's Word is the Church whose unflinching courage is equal to her unflinching confidence. Intellectualism in this respect assumes the role of destructive criticism. Herein is its weakness: for the normal condition of the human mind is truth, not relentless deadly criticism. Nor do we see the signs of approaching death. We are not pessimistic. With all the activity of the age and the rush for wealth and the sins of society we see our churches crowded with men of faith who give their heart to God and who share their goods with the poor. All have not bowed their knee to Baal, nor have any but the fool denied the existence of God. The Church no doubt is passing through a severe crisis. Visibly it is abandoned by the nations. It leans still more upon that invisible support of truth and God's Holy Spirit. The Pontiff's voice is strong and clear. It is listened to with deference by more than ever before. But even if the sky were dark and lowering, and the waves hard pressing upon the boat, faith does not falter. When things are at their worst God's might shows best and His mercy is brightest; so is it with the Church. Her long career has been one of almost uninterrupted struggle. Few and short her triumphs, she looks not for glory here, nor is her life to be measured by the standard of earthly kingdoms. Her work is not yet accomplished, her fight not over; she must continue her labors. The same power that started her nineteen hundred years ago will preserve her still in truth, and long after the little professor of Cornell has passed from the scene, and learned that there is much more than was ever dreamed of in his philosophy.

What is resignation? It is putting God between one's self and one's grief. The Christian's cup may be brimful of sorrow, but, for him, the overflowing drop is never added.

MR. SELLAR.

A press despatch from Huntingdon, Que., informs us that on October 8, a severe shock of earthquake struck that village, apparently coming from the south. The shock was violent, lasting several seconds, awakening people from their sleep. A perceptible trembling of the houses was felt, and people turned on the electric lights and many hastily dressed. The people expected a repetition of the shock and lay awake, but no further vibration was experienced. It was the severest shock, lasting such a perceptible period of time, that has occurred in this section.

This will give Mr. Robert Sellar, editor of the Huntingdon Gleaser, an opportunity to write another book about the Catholic Church in Quebec. He would be enabled to convince quite a number of Ontario people that the "Romish" Church, and the French Canadian curés were responsible for this new scheme to get rid of the Protestant population of the province.

THE ACADIANS.

A few weeks ago, in the Saturday edition of the Toronto Globe, appeared a paper from the pen of Mr. Nicol Kingsmill, in which he attempted to excuse the conduct of Governor Lawrence in expelling the French Catholic people from their homes in Acadia. In last Saturday's edition of the same paper appeared a reply to Mr. Kingsmill from the pen of Mr. H. F. Macintosh of Toronto, a gentleman well qualified to deal with the subject. We have much pleasure in reproducing in its entirety Mr. Macintosh's letter. It is unfortunate that, in treating of historical subjects, there is a class of men who will never shed their religious or national prejudices. It seems as if Mr. Kingsmill were a Canadian edition of Mr. Podsnap, a gentleman who, in "Our Mutual Friend," upon hearing anything derogatory to England, became very much excited and brushed all such assertions away with one sweep of his arm, Mr. Podsnap all the while believing that the British constitution was the work of Divine Providence. Mr. Kingsmill appears to be one of those writers, many of whom are to be found in England, and a few in Toronto, who would cheerfully put a coat of white-wash on the memory of the Eighth Henry, and excuse, on state grounds, his fondness for a large assortment of wives. They would likewise have us believe that Oliver Cromwell's butcheries in Ireland were quite justifiable, and the massacre of Glencoe a political expediency. Men who are schooled to an exaltation of their country which savors of the ridiculous—men who, while at their literary work bench, are eternally humming and drumming "Britons Never, Never, Never," etc., may succeed in having their wares licked into print by type setting machines, to be glanced at today and forgotten tomorrow, but their wares will never find place in carefully selected libraries. Mr. Macintosh writes:

The article of Mr. Kingsmill on what he is pleased to call the "Acadian Myth" is a good example of what in heretofore has joined to superficial knowledge and accomplish. It is plain to any one who has had acquaintance with the authorities he cites, or who he has the "authorities" themselves are not based on documentary evidence so much as on the received traditions of the defendant; for, be it ever borne in mind, it is not the Acadians but the British authorities that are on trial, and to the guilt or innocence of Governor Lawrence, earnest attempts have in recent years been made to clear his reputation from the charges of treachery and cruelty, but no one who has studied the question carefully can say that these attempts have been successful. Of the Acadian side Mr. Kingsmill appears to be in blissful ignorance, nor evidently, has he ever heard of Murdoch, Atkins or Haliburton (all English authorities), not to speak of Casgrain, Ferland and Shea, who have all published exhaustive studies of the subject. Parkman alone he cites, but without in the least detracting from the fame that is justly that great writer's due, it may safely be said that his histories are based less on original material than on the labors of earlier if less famous investigators in the same field. Indeed it is, I believe, quite demonstrable that to the long and arduous labors of Dr. John Gilmary Shea, the historian of the Mississippi Valley, and of the Catholic Church in the United States, Parkman is largely indebted for the material which he has woven into narrative with such skill and success. He has himself in some measure acknowledged this, though not to the extent that others consider was Dr. Shea's due. It is beside the question, however, to dwell upon this here, but in passing it may be said that a careful examination of Parkman's histories will hardly bear out Mr. Kingsmill's interpretation of them.

It is not the intention to enter upon a discussion of the question here. It is too vast and too far reaching for the columns of a newspaper, and, besides, the literature of the subject is open to the world. There is just one point calling for comment. Mr. Kingsmill says the sole demand made upon the Acadians by Governor Lawrence was that "they must either take in unconditional oath of British allegiance or submit to deportation," but he does not say that this oath involved proscription of their religion. It is true they were promised the free exercise of their religion, "as far as the laws of

England do allow the same." A plausible enough promise, on the face of it, but as specious as it is plausible, for, to know what it involved, one has only to bear in mind the treatment of Catholics in Great Britain at the time, when to be true to one's religion was to lay oneself open to confiscation of property and incarceration of person; when to frequent Mass or to harbor a priest was a crime; when to be a priest, and to be caught in the exercise of the priestly functions was a still greater crime. Efforts have been made to show that such was not the interpretation put upon the law by Governor Lawrence, but their past experience afforded the Acadians no warrant for putting any trust in his word. If the oath required of them had been a simple pledge of fidelity and allegiance to George II, there is no reason for supposing it would have been refused. Such an oath had been taken by them in times past. From Lawrence's subsequent language, however, it is evident that the oath required of the colonists at this time was such as no Catholic could take without putting himself without the pale of the law or apostatizing. Is it to be wondered that the delegates of the Acadicians of whom this demand was made remonstrated, and asked some tangible assurance that faith would be kept with them? Their remonstrance was unheeded, and they were summarily dismissed from the Governor's presence. In conference on the following day, when they agreed among themselves that, as the lesser of two evils, they would accept the Governor's terms and take the oath, they were told it was too late; that as there was no reason to hope that their proposed compliance proceeded from an honest mind, and could be esteemed only the effect of compulsion and force, and is contrary to a clause in an act of Parliament of 1 George II, c. 13, whereby persons who have once refused to take the oath cannot be afterwards permitted to take them, but are considered Popish recusants; therefore they would not be indulged with such promises.

It was thus distinctly avowed that the action taken against them was as Catholics, and under the English penal laws. This is corroborated by the fact that instructions were sent to take special care to seize the priests. The whole thing had been prearranged, and the demand for submission above outlined was not made until preparations for the deportation were completed. They were condemned without trial and with no opportunity to put in a defence, as Judge Haliburton, more honest than later writers, admits. The oaths were never tendered to the Acadians individually nor refused by them, but in their absence seven thousand British subjects were tried by a Governor and four Councilors; every principle of English jurisprudence disregarded, and not a simple record drawn from which they could frame an appeal. This is the sum and substance of the whole matter, and no special pleading in the name of peace and good order can change it. Further, Dr. Shea has shown that every step of Lawrence was illegal and a crime. No such law as that of "1 George II, c. 13," exists in the statute book of Great Britain which can apply to the case of the Acadians. The law was a pure invention of the Governor, the act referred to (which is really 1 George I, c. 13) having reference only to Catholics holding office, and the penalty for refusing the oath being loss of office. At the same time it expressly exempts from the consequences of recusancy any Catholic subsequently taking the oath who had previously refused it.

The nefarious scheme of deporting the Acadians to the West Indies was planned and secretly. "The Acadian" was at the 400 point points were summoned to meet the English officials," says Dr. Shea, "and were at once surrounded and disarmed, only 500 (out of the whole number of 7000) escaping to the woods. Their cattle were slaughtered or divided among English settlers; then the women and children were forced to leave their homes and march to the shore, seeing behind them their houses, barns and churches blazing in one general conflagration. The unfortunate people were then marched on board the ships, no regard being paid to ties of kindred and affection."

Mr. Kingsmill is right; the thing will not down, and no attempt to explain it away or to interpret it in the interest of the oppressor can lessen the magnitude of the crime.

Dublin's Temperance Day.

Dublin has a Temperance Day—a new holiday come to stay and to become a National Holiday—instituted last year by the Dublin Workmen's Temperance Committee, in connection with the celebration of the anniversary of Father Mathew's crusade against drink. This year September 8 was chosen for a splendid procession and public meeting around Father Mathew's statue in O'Connell street. The day was fine, O'Connell street was a living mass of people, and the bands and banners were numerous and inspiring.

Very Rev. Father Aloysius, the Capuchin, presided at the meeting. Mr. Wm. Redmond made a good speech. He reminded them that the English Government was never interested in a temperance movement, but encouraged drink, not only for the revenue gathered from it, but because also a strictly temperate people were a hard people to keep down.

Mr. T. W. Russell, M. P., spoke also recalling the York Street Temperance Club of fifty years ago and all the good it did.—Sacred Heart Review.

Our Protestant friends have suddenly grown very tender and sensitive about having their clergy officiate at the remarriage of divorced persons, and our Protestant friends adopting this attitude. The quiet, steady, persistent teaching of the Catholic Church on this matter is undoubtedly leaving its effect upon Protestantism.—Sacred Heart Review.

Translated for The FRANCISCAN OF THE MODERN BY HIS HOLINESS PIUS X.

To all the Patriarchs, bishops, Bishops, and archbishops who are at communion with the Holy See.

Venerable Brothers, against the profane usage as well as against the false science in connection with the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary, it is true that there is such vigilance necessary for the through the investigation of the human race, been wanting men of (Act. xx. 30), preachers and seducers (Tim. I. of error leading un- III. 13).

It must, however, that a wondrous in place of late in the enemies of the Cross, who, with wholly new treacherous artifice the vital energies of who, if they could, the Kingdom of Jesus not remain silent to appear faithless to our duties and have hitherto displayed amendment construe our charge.

What especially should lose no time to search among our enemies for the lives of a matter for to and sorrow that the very bosom of therefore are more openly declaring the We refer, Venerable great number of the what is more deplored who, under guise of Church, pose, in defiance of the solemnly acknowledged and thoroughly saturated of error drawn from the Catholic faith, they boldly assailed sacred in the worshipping no respect to son, which, in their city, they would deliver common ordinary to These persons, in our classifying the Church. Setting aside of which God is the eximies their connection with them speaking and acting at our classification Church they assume that the Church is not an ordinary As we have seen outside, but from would compass her is located in the v of the Church. T enemies are all the cause they know I They have applied branches but to the in other words, the root of immortal the task of spreading the entire tree. The Catholic Faith, their attack; none employ all their energy while they pursue their sinister designs so insidious or so tactics. Combating kinds of characters and the Catholic, the cleverness and ill-informed. Over rashness, they are sort of consequences is no theory that cate loudly and oblation to all this displaying in the activity, and in the kinds of studies. It are concerned that the strictest kind appears to remove is that their doctrine ed their souls the contemptuous of all in their perversion act in such a way to pure zeal for the more than the wife. We admit that they would their ways, and treated them with kindness, then widely, much to our to publicly reprimand Venerable Brothers Our efforts: bow their heads in false than the id are clear out ans, then, to pres you at the ou and show you connect them. quently to indi