

PROTESTANT CONTROVERSY.

XVII.

The author of "Romanism and the Republic," whose book consists of a number of sermons first delivered to his own congregation, takes as the text of his first discourse God's declaration to the prophet Ezekiel, that if the people of the land appoint a watchman against the enemy, and calamity should result from his negligence, God will require of the watchman a strict account of all the disasters that may have resulted from his unfaithfulness.

This is the keynote of the whole popular controversy against Roman Catholicism. The controversy would amount to little were it not for the constant assumption that spiritual allegiance to Rome is inconsistent with civil allegiance to the Government.

If this is the case, then the controversy with Rome is not predominantly an ecclesiastical, but a civil concern. This being so, it would not appertain to a church, or to the churches collectively, to appoint men who should warn the nation against Catholic disloyalty, and who should show the people how Roman Catholics must of necessity be unfaithful citizens. Such appointments would belong to the nation, in its civil capacity. The author clearly signifies it in the title of his work: "Romanism and the Republic." He signifies it with equal clearness in this initial text. It is "the people of the land" that are to appoint the watchman.

Now let me ask the Reverend Isaac J. Lansing: When, sir, has the American nation appointed you a guardian of her interests against Rome? At no time. Then why should you not be proceeded against before the courts, or if not there before the bar of public opinion, as a presumptuous usurper of a momentous civil charge which has never been committed to you? If the nation has not charged you with the grave and critical responsibility, has the Commonwealth? No more than the nation. Nay, if you have effrontery enough to declare that the Church has a right to care for the nation's civil affairs, when the nation will not care for its own, have you been commissioned by the General Council of your own denomination? You have not. Or by the General Association of Massachusetts? You have not. Or even by the local conference of Worcester County. No. Nay, were you even commissioned by your own congregation? There is no appearance of it. These sermons are given by you as something entirely out of your own head. Yet by your chosen text you declare that the function which you have assumed to discharge is a civil function, of capital importance, which it appertains to the nation to commit to chosen and trustworthy men. Assuredly, if this office is what you make it out to be, it is of the most delicate responsibility. An indiscreet exercise of it in the name of the nation (for it is in the name of the nation that you speak) might easily land us in irretrievable confusion, possibly even in civil war.

Compared with such a function the usual duties of the Presidency are external, almost mechanical. Why should you not then be denounced as a much more dangerous and presumptuous usurper than a man who should seat himself in the White House without warrant of law. On your showing I can not see why.

Note: opposition to Rome by a clergyman, however virulent, is no violation of his place as a citizen so long as it is strictly theological. He may call the Pope "the beast," or "the man of sin," and the Papacy "the great apostasy," "Satan's masterpiece," and he is guilty of no civil presumption. Catholics freely denounce Protestantism as "Anti-Christ," and Luther as "a monster," and Protestant missions among the heathen as a "gigantic swindle," and no reasonable man will say that either party must first ask the leave of the State. I am free to suggest that Masonry is a work of the devil, and to declare that Spiritism is foretold by the apocalyptic locusts rising out of the pit, though I have not been nationally commissioned to do either, for my declarations would not imply, even remotely, a proposal to deprive Freemasons or Spiritualists of their civil franchises.

We must, therefore, divide Protestantism into two classes. The first, and I suspect much the smaller, is made up of those who, however severe in their animadversions, imply no serious intention of disfranchising Catholics. Such denunciations, however unnamable, are plainly within their civil right. In our country, at least, the government would not hold itself free to restrain these controversies, unless in circumstances in which they would occasion an immediate outbreak of violence. "Language calculated to provoke a breach of the peace," must, of course, in all impersonal discussions, be very rigorously construed.

The other class, of which "Romanism and the Republic" is a typical exemplification, directs all its efforts to the disfranchisement of the Roman Catholics, either completely, or at least to the extent of their exclusion from office, or from all the higher offices, whether by legislation or by a fixed understanding, like that by which, thus far, every President has been kept out of a third term. This policy is that which, from beginning to end, is represented by "Romanism and the Republic." It does not deal much in specific proposals of disfranchisement, but aims at laying a foundation of opinion on which they can be advantage-

ously built up. The author declares complete Catholic disfranchisement desirable. He says that if the courts acted on their own principles, they would, and should, disfranchise every Roman Catholic in America. He declares, again and again, that he is not arguing against Catholicism theologically, but politically, yet his book has extended theological discussions. It follows that he views all who hold these doctrines, most of which are purely religious, unfit for citizenship.

This gives us the measure of the man, and of the book, and of the whole class. Their animosity against the Roman Catholics is at bottom bitterly theological. They are fully bent on expressing their hatred by persecution. Yet as our Federal Government, and most of our States, have definitely refused to impose penalties or civil disabilities on any speculative opinions whatsoever, they are forced, in spite of themselves, on to political ground. Yet it is a very thin disguise. The veneration of the Virgin and of the Saints, and the doctrine of Transubstantiation, can not by any ingenuity be tortured into a political application, or made out to be inconsistent with the temper of honest citizenship. Mr. Lansing, however, makes quick work here.

"These opinions are heathenish. We ought not to suffer heathenish religion or heathenish morality in our republic. Therefore the Roman Catholics ought not to be suffered to vote, nor to teach their religion to their children." I can make nothing else out of his reasoning. I do not think that he means anything else to be made out of it. Indeed one of his head- ings is: "Shall Romanism teach a Pagan morality to American youth?" Now no one dreams of teaching Roman Catholic doctrines to Protestant pupils in our Public schools. What meaning then can this possibly have but this: "Shall Roman Catholics be allowed to bring up their own children in their own religion?" If there is another meaning, let Mr. Lansing write and tell me what it is, and I will publish it. Until he does, the obvious interpretation I have given must prevail. However, I hardly feel free to charge this class of men with hypocrisy in saying one thing and meaning another. The veil which they throw over their purpose of religious persecution is far too thin to hide their intent. As they mean, as soon as they can, to violate American principles out-and-out, a decent declaration of veneration for them is graceful, and takes no one in. It is simply like "Not at home" to an unwelcome visitor.

Before going into these American proposals, let us consider a religion which actually is what these people would have us believe Roman Catholicism to be. I mean Mohammedanism. There is no dispute here. In this religion Church and State are absolutely one. The Caliph, that is at present the Sultan, is acknowledged, in theory, as having unlimited power in every direction. No true believer is permitted to question a command of his, temporal or spiritual. Should he command the Sunnite Moslems of India (for the Shiites do not acknowledge him) to revolt against the Emperor, I do not say they would obey in fact. I hardly think they would. Yet they would certainly be brought into a great stress of conscience. Nay, even now, without a command, they are very uneasy in obeying an "infidel" Emperor, in a country once under Moslem control, and, therefore, by their religion, never capable of being lawfully governed by a Christian monarch. It is true, they have had reassuring explanations from Mecca. Yet, after all, these are only palliatives. Many—perhaps not all—often ask themselves: Ought I not to revolt against the unbelievers at all hazards? The terrible mutiny of 1857, though only partially Mohammedan, broke out around a Moslem emperor. It can not be said there will never be another.

"The soil Decent lies over subjugated fires."

Now how do the English deal with this state of things? With the generous boldness of a great and free people. They reflect that men are not responsible for their hereditary religion. They are responsible to the law only for their acts. So long as they obey the legitimate enactments of the Government this is bound to accept their obedience. It has no right to turn itself into an inquisition and to intrude into the forum of conscience. Time was when England did this, but she does it no longer. If a frank obedience is rendered she owns that she has no business to ask on what grounds. It may be given from a hearty sense of moral duty. This would be the obedience of all sincere Christians, Protestant or Catholic, Western or Oriental. As Frondus says, who certainly hates Rome cordially enough: "The Roman Catholicism of to-day does not 'cast even a shadow on allegiance.' Obedience may be rendered from a grateful sense of beneficent rule. This, doubtless, the motive of the higher classes of Indian Mohammedans. They see, too, that England sincerely grants to their religion the same freedom as to her own, and that though she sees Mohammedanism spreading under this policy, she does not hypocritically try to take back with one hand what she gives with the other. The common Moslems obey because they now have peace and justice, and do not know what would come of a breaking up."

It is true, nevertheless, that there are deep lying assumptions of Islam which have before now broken out in terrible devastation, and which may possibly break out again. We may take certain precautions against the effects of an earthquake, but whether the earthquake shall come, is a matter

that must be left to a mightier Hand. Indeed we cannot tell in any land what forces may be lying under a quiet surface. We cannot tell what explosive forces may be lying in our own breasts. England wisely and courageously disarms forebodings which may never be realized, and entrusts to the higher ability and integrity of the Mohammedans above the Hindus a large share of work of Indian administration. The result abundantly justifies her, and this generous confidence renders it continually more difficult for the Moslems even to wish to actuate the dangerous possibilities of their religion. Indeed there are old Indians who think a far more unreserved confidence yet deserved by the Moslems, and certain to be of great benefit to India.

Now suppose that India had been given over to an English Committee of One Hundred. This would fairly have choked in the abundance of matter offered to its passion for malicious mischief. Frank confidence would have been in its eyes a mere craving for suicide. Mohammedan talent, integrity, public spirit, would have been mere sugar-coated treason. Every commission which sheer necessity had compelled it to give to a Moslem would have been given with so wary a face as to deepen contemptuous hatred where it existed and to create it where it did not. Had they had there the counterparts of our Boston celebrities, half the English would have been massacred and the other half driven into the sea. Happily, a strong hand has been held over such people in India, and so England still has her Empire.

Charles C. Starbuck. Andover, Mass.

A GREAT EXAMPLE.

There was much in the life of the late Sir Stuart Knill that would have made him an example to Catholics in any country and an ornament of the Church in any age. A shrewd man of business, he found time, while amassing a vast fortune, for his visit to the Blessed Sacrament, his regular frequent Communion, his extra weekly Mass, and the little sanctities of daily life. A man of great responsibility, he preserved a cheerful, placid demeanor under interruptions and irritations, ever scrupulously discharging the duties of father and friend,—hospitable, kindly and generous; promptly responsive to every call of charity. A man of the world, he took a knightly pride in professing before men his loyalty to the old Mother Church; and when his blushing honors crowded fullest upon him—when he had risen to the highest municipal office in the British Empire,—he went to visit the Catholic college in which he was educated, and asked as a favor to be permitted to serve the students' Mass, as he had done in his boyhood days.

His life, we repeat, would have been an honor to the Church in any age and in any country; but there are reasons why his example is especially valuable in this country and at this time. When Stuart Knill was chosen Lord Mayor of London, there would have been few to reproach him had he strained a point to prove to Englishmen that a Catholic might be trusted "with the dearest interests of the people; that Catholics are not prigs nor hide-bound bigots; and that the rules of social, official and even religious intercourse, which Protestants call tyrannous, are susceptible of wide and easy interpretation. Strictly speaking, he was the first Catholic Lord Mayor since the Reformation. There are many reasons and numerous circumstances which would justify him, as the Mayor of "the largest and most Protestant city in the world," in straining a point to avoid wounding the susceptibilities of good people, who, not understanding the fine points of theology, readily lend him to attend heretical services merely in his official capacity.

Stuart Knill had served only a few months in office when it was suggested that, following the example of other Lord Mayors, he ought to attend the official services in St. Paul's (Protestant) Cathedral. "If he had been a man accustomed to insincerities or ready to pay lip service for potage," says the Tablet, "there was a precedent, ready to suggest that he might easily compromise with his conscience. He might have explained that his attendance in a Protestant place of worship was purely formal; that, while his body was present, his heart was absent. But that sort of poor double-dealing was absolutely alien to the straightforwardness that had marked all his life. He looked the temptation straight in the eyes, and then, to his eternal honor, announced with all courteousness, but unmistakable firmness, that he would not deviate from Catholic usage, or stoop to subterfuge to pick up the highest honor which London can bestow."

Before his election, there had been a mighty howl against the candidacy of a Catholic for the ancient and honorable position of Lord Mayor. He had been severely catechized by the bigots as to the course he should follow in matters of religion in case he were elected. He had not flinched then, but answered that, whether as mayor or as merchant, he would ever remain an uncompromising Catholic. It was not for him, who had stood with such superb constancy during the trying times of a campaign, to waver now that he actually wore the robes of office, and the public letter in which he announced his decision has the ring of the old Catholic metal that makes Sir Thomas More an everlasting example. His words are precious. "It may perhaps be argued," he wrote, "that I might be present materially and passively, without taking any part in the service. That might be so. But,

without reverting to what I have said already as to the insincerity of such a presence, how would such fine distinctions between a material and a religious presence be received and understood by the English people? It is also necessary to consider the case of multitudes in workhouses and other institutions, of governesses and servants, and others who feel in conscience bound to suffer, and even to give up their situations, rather than attend religious services in which they cannot conscientiously take part. No! It would never do for a Lord Mayor of London to avail himself of a subtle distinction such as this, which would be widely misunderstood, while it would be without the poor excuse of having been adopted under dire necessity."

The effect of his manly adhesion to principle upon the public mind can hardly be imagined at this distance of time and space. Grumbling there was among many, and hard words from the narrow minded; but it is safe to say that the best people of Protestant London were proud of their fearless and conscientious Lord Mayor. And when Stuart Knill went a step farther, and at a public banquet proposed as the first toast "The Pope and the Queen"—giving to the Holy Father the precedence which of right was his,—there was none to question his loyalty, though there were many (the bigots again) to question his taste. His manhood had partially won even them; for when his term as Mayor had expired, his stout Catholic was chosen alderman of an important ward in London; and public respect for him was further demonstrated when, at the same election, his son was chosen alderman of another ward. Certainly the Queen herself took no umbrage at his public preference for the Pope; she signalled his retirement from the mayoralty by conferring on him the honor of knighthood.

A knightly soul he was, and a wholesome example for us who live in an atmosphere of heresy and compromise. Let American Catholics learn from this great man that a rigid interpretation of duty is no bar to the esteem of all whose good opinion is worth having; that to be a "trimmer" in matters of conscience is to lower one's flag and to trade in one's manhood; that good Protestants respect good Catholics the more because they have old-fashioned, ultramontane views about frequenting sectarian conventicles; and, finally, that, even in the eyes of worldly men, fidelity to private conscience is the surest guarantee of fidelity to public trust. Ave. Maria.

CHANGE OF THE PROTESTANT HEART.

From the Boston Pilot. Our esteemed Protestant contemporary, the Congregationalist, closes its series of papers by Janet Sanderson on "Seven Great Hymns of the Medieval Ages" with the "Stabat Mater Speciosa," a medieval Christmas hymn by Jacoponus, the author of the much better known "Stabat Mater Dolorosa." He wished by the former to glorify the brief life of Mary's virgin motherhood at Bethlehem ere the sword of Simeon's prophecy had pierced her heart to prepare it for her dolorous watch on Calvary, when she shared the sufferings by which Her Divine Son redeemed mankind. It says much for the progress of Catholic ideas outside the Church to find this series on the old Catholic hymns in a distinctly Protestant journal, and we can forgive the Congregationalist's expression of its own evident misunderstanding of the Catholic unity of faith when it lets Catholic faith and devotion speak for themselves in those hymns of the Church. A still greater change of the Protestant heart is manifested by the Watchman (Baptist) displaying a fine print of the Stabat Madonna on the cover of its Christmas number. All who truly seek the Christ-Child know that, like the shepherds and the Kings of old, they must find Him with His Mother.

The softness and the glare and the temptations and the license and the lax examples that are about us are more seducing and dangerous than the winter of penitence. They hardened the manhood of Catholic parents. The summer sun relaxes many.—Cardinal Manning.

Why will you allow a cough to lacerate your throat or lungs and run the risk of filling a consumptive's in? When, by the timely use of Bickel's Anti-Consumptive Syrup the pain can be allayed and the danger avoided. This Syrup is pleasant to the taste, and unsurpassed for relieving, healing and curing all affections of the throat and lungs, coughs, colds, bronchitis, etc., etc.

When the children are hungry, what do you give them? Food.

When thirsty? Water.

Now use the same good common sense, and what would you give them when they are too thin? The best fat-forming food, of course.

Somehow you think of Scott's Emulsion at once.

For a quarter of a century it has been making thin children, plump; weak children, strong; sick children, healthy.

sec. and \$2.00, all druggists. SCOTT & BOWNE, Chemists, Toronto.

TISSOT'S VISION.

From "Tissot's Famous Paintings"—by Jas. W. Clarkson, in January Donahoe's.

He saw a ruined castle, a "modern castle," he takes care to tell us, and a man and woman crouching among the broken stones. They were miserable creatures, old, infirm and ragged, bending under the weight of all human sorrows, desperate, with nothing to hope for in this world or in the next. There they sat, among the ruins of that modern civilization which had vainly entrusted to science and liberty the task of guiding man to justice and happiness, and which knows that it is perishing, a victim to the hatred and envy it is powerless to appease, because it has neither faith nor hope. "O God! O God!" the two poor wretches groaned in their despair. And lo! a form appeared in the dark sky above them, and, floating downward, gently, silently sat beside them, a comforter, a brother, the God to whom they had unconsciously appealed. The blood streams from His thorn-crowned brow and from His pierced hands. Their sorrows are great, but what are they to His? They recognize the Christ, they feel Him near, and this nearness consoles them and inspires them with new courage for the battle of life.

The vision haunted him, followed him to his home, was his companion in every scene, grave or gay. He thought by painting it he might get rid of this uncomfortable visitant. The result was "The Inward Voices," the first picture that meets the eyes of the visitor on entering Gallery A. It is the only one in oils in the series, and in which the figures are life-size. It is, in fact, the frontispiece of the work, and gives the clue by which it is to be interpreted. All the details are symbolic as well as the characters. The mantle that covers Christ is intended to represent the hierarchy of His Church. Other features are typical of the sin of Adam and Eve, the Passion, etc.

The best way to avoid sickness is to keep yourself healthy by taking Hood's Sarsaparilla, the great blood purifier.

MISSIONARIES TO NON-CATHOLICS.

LICS.

The success of the Catholic missions to non Catholics seems to be assured. In their work they follow closely the Church's method of teaching, and that is the authoritative one. She does not take the truths of faith and hold them up, one after another, for discussion. She does not send the child out on a tour of inquiry as to whether the incarnation be a truth, as to whether the doctrine of the Holy Trinity be a truth, as to whether the eternal recompense of the good and the eternal punishment of the wicked be a truth, as to whether the immortality of the soul be a truth. That is the Protestant system. Christianity could never have been promulgated by such a system; such a system could never have been the foundation of holiness; the child could never be a believer under such a system. There is no compromise between private judgment and an infallible Church, and all who do not yield to the authority of an infallible Church are thrown back upon private judgment. The Protestant system sets one on a voyage of discovery without compass, without helm, without pilot. The ship—that is the mind of the person outside the Catholic Church—is launched out on the angry sea of doubt in search of the undiscovered land of truth. The Church is the only true teacher, and her missionaries expound and explain the one true system established by Jesus Christ; hence their success.—American Herald.

A Quebecer's Confidence in Dr. Chase's Catarrh Cure—Gives Relief at Once. He Says:

Danville, P. Q., April 9th, 1898. EDWARDS, KATES & CO., Toronto. Dear Sirs,—Enclosed find \$1 for 1 dozen boxes Dr. Chase's Catarrh Cure. Please send them at once. Every patient using it says: "It is an excellent cure, gives relief at once."

JAS. MASSON, Gen'l Merchant, Danville, P. Q.

LOOK OUT for the first signs of Impure Blood—Hood's Sarsaparilla is your safeguard. It will purify, enrich and vitalize your blood.

EASY QUICK WORK. SNOWY WHITE CLOTHES.



SURPRISE SOAP

MAKES CHILD'S PLAY OF WASH DAY

A SINGER SEWING-MACHINE

THE BEST INVESTMENT ON EARTH, earning more in proportion to cost than any other purchase possible.

THREE DIFFERENT KINDS, either lock-stitch or chain-stitch.

BUILT LIKE A WATCH, at the largest and best-equipped factory in the world, where every machine is carefully tested on practical stitching.

SOLD ONLY BY THE SINGER MANUFACTURING CO.

75 cents in postage stamps sent to Benziger Brothers, 36 & 38 Barclay St., New York, is the easiest way to pay for a year's subscription.

A GOOD AGENT WANTED IN EVERY TOWN FOR THE NEW ILLUSTRATED CATHOLIC MONTHLY OUR BOYS' GIRLS OWN

PROFITABLE EMPLOYMENT FOR THE WINTER. Commission Paid. Which Insures Good Income.

ONLY APPLICANTS WITH REFERENCES WILL BE CONSIDERED.

SPECIAL REWARD: \$100.00 in cash will be given to the Agent who sends us the largest list of subscribers before April 1, 1909, and \$50.00 in cash to the Agent who sends us the next largest list.

"Our Boys' and Girls' Own" now appears with a beautiful colored cover.

For further information apply to the Publishers: BENZIGER BROTHERS, NEW YORK.

Subscriptions for "Our Boys' and Girls' Own," received at the Catholic Record office. 75c per annum.

We have a few copies left of the bible we some time ago offered at \$7. It is bound in more expensive style than the one referred to above. Any one who would prefer having a copy of this bible should order at once, as the stock will be exhausted in a short time.

In all cases cash must accompany order, and if the book is not entirely satisfactory it may be returned at our expense and the money will be refunded.

O. LABELLE, MERCHANT TAILOR

372 Richmond Street. Best Business Suits from \$15 upwards. The best goods and careful workmanship.

JANUARY 21, 1909.

FIVE-MINUTES' SERMON.

Third Sunday after the Epiphany.

SINNERS, WASH OFF THE LEPROSY OF YOUR SOUL.

"Lord, if Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean." (Matt. 8, 2.)

What leprosy is to the body, sin is to the soul. Leprosy is a loathsome, incurable disease, which covers the whole body with suppurating swellings and ulcers, rendering it like to a disgusting corpse. So great is the contagion of this disease that whoever comes in contact with it, has every reason to fear that he has imbibed the fatal poison. And is this not similar to sin? The leprosy of the soul? Does not sin rob the soul of sanctifying grace, of its supernatural beauty, and does it wound the soul in a horrible manner? Does not this spiritual leprosy, by pestilential odor, spread everywhere, the poison of contagion? Does it not exclude man from the society of God and the angels, and expose him to the greatest danger to fall a victim to eternal death, to everlasting punishment?

Oh, truly lamentable condition of sinner separated from God! Would you say of a person who would be so foolish as to sleep on the brink of a frightful precipice? Only a slight change of position and he is hurled into the fearful abyss! Behold, O sinner, you who are separated from God, contemplate your picture. This is a dangerous condition in which your soul now is. Do you know with certainty whether you will be alive or not? Ah, no man knows the hour of his summons, and yet, you to be immediately called before the throne of God, what would be your lot for all eternity? Do you not tremble at the mere thought that you would be a reprobate without redemption, without mercy, cast away in the unsearchable fathoms of hell? Madman, you venture for a ton of gold, to the tip of your finger during the half a minute of a glowing life!

And, you are willing to risk ruin for all eternity in that fiery hell which has been kindled, not by mercy of God, like our earthly sin, but by His terrible anger? O sinner, take heed to my warning! I have admonished you in God's name. are lost, you alone will wallow in the Mea culpa, through my fault.

But what should you do to the anger of God, and to save your soul while there is yet time? To the leper in the gospel of St. Luke, his example will teach you. He had heard that the Kingdom of Heaven was passing when with filial confidence turned to that merciful Heart, "Lord, if Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean." Oh! what humility, simplicity, what confidence does this petition contain! Jesus is there, and hastens to reward the penitent. He speaks only of his body: "I will be, thou clean," and instantly the leprosy is cleansed. O sinner, alone it depends to receive a grace; for the mercy of your Ruler is as great now as it was a hundred years ago. Prostrate before the Blessed Sacrament, mercy-seat, and confess your sins in the presence of God, your future who is there really present.

act of perfect contrition, your greivances, be sincerely sorry merely for having deserved your punishment for having offended your Lord, your God. This contrition, capable, as faith teaches, of cancelling your guilt and of restoring the peace of reconciliation before you have confessed your sins, an act of perfect contrition, purify your soul immediately, leprosy, and make you the child of God and heir of His Kingdom, however, forget what requires of the cleansed soul to him: "Go and show to the priest!" So must having by an act of perfect contrition obtained forgiveness, full remission of God, which is to show your loyalty to the sacrament of penance, firm resolution of confessing at the earliest opportunity accompanied with this act of contrition, although the sins remitted by perfect contrition.

Beloved Christians, you the means whereby to obtain of the leprosy of your soul, time you should be in danger and have no opportunity of your sins, make an act of contrition with the resolution of confession. Should death overtaken you without confession, in God a merciful Judge. I beg of you, apply this to reconciliation only when death—use it as often as misfortune of falling ill. We are never secure and may die at any moment, therefore, to live with God, when hell bursts forth and death can in any way before the judgment.

Let us, therefore, free from sin, and if, unfortunately, been infected by it, seek immediately, so that it always find us, like faithful waiting and watching for Amen.

In Reply to Off Reporters: It may be well to state, acts as a food as well as a nuptial washed issues and health after washing fever. Only those who have felt tell the tortures cause boots on, pain with them today; but relief is sure to follow's Corn Cure.