

fare. As a recent writer has expressed it, the motto of the vast majority of the statesmen of the day is, "myself, party, country, myself," of which the important portion is the extremes. They perhaps spend their political existence in fortifying the bulwarks of their party; but they show no generosity in this, for their hope is that they will find behind them a place of shelter in times of adversity. A nation's representatives may engage themselves in extending its commercial relations, in inventing schemes to increase population; they may busy themselves in matters of finance or in negotiating treaties; its law-givers may possess the mental power of an Aristotle; yet they have been raising a structure on a foundation of sand, which will not long withstand the destructive influence of time, if all has not been laid on a firm basis of morality and religion. That ancient philosopher who wrote, "one might as well attempt to build a castle in the air as to found a state without religion," recognized the prime importance of the part which the superhuman must play in order to ensure permanency and stability in all national undertakings. And what was the religion of the ancients but a mere collection of myths? Nevertheless it was when this religious sentiment actuated rulers in all their doings, and was preserved among the people in a more or less uncorrupted state, that a high standard of morality and respect for authority were maintained and that prosperity was enjoyed. When it was abandoned or began to decay, national greatness also disappeared. If history teaches any lesson, it is certainly that of the absolute necessity of religion to the state as the only means of its preservation.

But it has been said that if religion has lost much of its influence as a factor in civil affairs, the spirit of intolerance and persecution which in former centuries was so violent and which ecclesiastical authority is accused of having encouraged, has entirely vanished. That intolerance is not so openly

displayed and accompanied with such physical force as in the past, cannot be denied; but it is certainly none the less active, effective and general. In olden times it was a storm at sea and the danger was for the greater part visible; to-day intolerance travels in undercurrents beneath the calm and still surface, but woe to the unsuspecting bark that falls a victim to its devouring waters. And yet the slogan of the day is, "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity." Little more than a century has passed by since the sun smiled on the first glorious fourth of July; the smoke of the cannon of Bunker Hill has scarcely cleared up; the echoes of the patriotic perorations of the fathers of the Great Republic still resound in our ears; but it is only recent history that tells us in mournful numbers of the refusal of the democratic party, the guardians of that precious inheritance of liberty which has been handed down to them by their forefathers, to confer nomination to the presidential chair on one whose only crime was that he bore relationship to a Catholic. Such is the tolerance of a nation whose very origin was based on the principle of the fullest measure of legitimate liberty and which boasts of the equality that is indiscriminately guaranteed to all its subjects. If in England, Catholicity excludes from the throne, it seems to be an unwritten law in the United States that one professing the tenets of that religion is *ipso facto* rendered incapable of even being nominated to the honor of chief executive officer. There is, however, this extenuating fact in favor of the former country, that there are more positions of prominence held by Catholics to-day under the British crown than have been granted to their co-religionists under the Stars and Stripes since the formation of the Union. Intolerance is yet prevalent in England; but we would simply like to present the mirror to those who love to look across the water in search of national defects and who point with scorn towards a people to