

have a plantation here (one of the finest in the State) and I am going to make you an offer. I am going to cut it up into farms, build each of you a good house, stock each farm, and let you run it yourself. There is but one condition to which you must all agree. You must not buy anything on credit. I have arranged with a bank to give each of you what you need, and you must let me know how much that will be each month. Understand, the only condition is that you ask credit of no one."

THIS IS AN act of practical philanthropy, worthy of imitation by capitalists and employers of labor everywhere. It not only bespeaks a high sense of Christian responsibility on Mr. Reilly's part, but a far-seeing economic outlook as well. Men are slow to learn that misuse of wealth brings neither happiness to themselves, nor an element of permanence to their families or to their estate. The seeds of discontent, which sooner or later ripen into social disorder, are sown in the soil of greed and oppression. Revolution is too often but the outcome of defiance on the part of the few of fundamental economic laws. This Louisiana planter has gone back to the Sermon on the Mount for his principles and among the great captains of industry is almost alone in his generation in giving practical exemplification of its teachings. He may be considered as among the first fruits of the Encyclical of Leo XIII. To us his example seems also to indicate that true benevolence was better understood on the plantations of the South for the most part in the old days, than in the soul-destroying factory towns of New England.

IN INTRODUCING the speaker of the evening at a luncheon tendered Dr. John R. Mott by the "Christian Synagogue," Toronto, Principal Gandier of Knox College gave it as his opinion that "the recognized leader of the missionary forces of the world is not the Pope of Rome, not the Archbishop of Canterbury, not an ecclesiastic at all—but John R. Mott." This is quite interesting. Dr. Mott is the much advertised apostle of "business and Christianity" in the United States, and, if we mistake not, was the leader in the big "boost" given to this particular type of religion in New York a year ago, for which, as it was announced, a group of Wall Street capitalists furnished the funds. It was going to "shake the continent to its centre," but notwithstanding the pains taken to convince the average American citizen that Business is the best Christianity, and Christianity the best business, the great shaking up does not seem to have had any appreciable effect upon either New York or the nation at large. This is perhaps best evidenced by the later movement, called the "Go-to-church Sunday," whose less ambitious object it is to induce the same average American Protestant to enter a place of public worship at least once a year.

BUT the boosting business itself has not yet subsided. It must be a great consolation to Dr. Mott to know that he has not only impressed Wall Street by his exertions but that staid Canadian Presbyterians have also fallen under his spell. How else account for Principal Gandier's extravagant apostrophe of the man? It was, of course, a safe thing to say in such company, for his type of hearer is not prone to scrutinize such utterances too closely. Mutual admiration and indiscriminate eulogy, with a large and generous claim as to results, are the things that go best with him. The actualities behind the claim do not usually concern him at all. His purse is responsive to anyone who can paint for him a roseate word picture, and a passing fling at the Pope warms him to the very marrow. Thereseate picture Dr. Mott certainly gave them—to Principal Gandier it fell to take care of the Pope.

IT IS NOT our intention to outline Dr. Mott's address. As reproduced in the Presbyterian it is sufficiently effusive to make entertaining reading and, making due allowance for the credulity of his hearers, was, as delivered, no doubt quite inspiring. We mean simply to contrast one or two of his utterances with the more judicial impressions of an independent observer in China. Dr. Mott described a preaching tour he made through that country. At Hong Kong he told them, 700 "noble Chinese students, after hearing him speak through an interpreter, de-

cided to become "Christian enquirers;" seventeen of them said they would be baptized on the following Sunday; he did not state that any of them had kept their word. Perhaps by then the enthusiasm had evaporated. The whirl-wind campaign is pressed into service even in China. In Shanghai he had "the same remarkable results." (Hong Kong and Shanghai are Treaty Ports and largely Europeanized); in the province of Confucius ("It had never," he said, "been possible for a Christian movement to be established in that city") the throng was so great that he had to have the Parliament Building to speak in, and it was "crowded to suffocation." "Enquirers" by the hundred gathered around him, and at Peking and Mukden there was a perfect stampede. The same note runs all through the address, judging by which the conversion of China to business Christianity is nothing more nor less than a question of funds and preachers. Had time and physical powers permitted Dr. Mott might have performed the feat himself. That is a fair deduction from his address—one of the most boastful and inflated that has ever come under our notice, and, what is more, entirely out of harmony with the facts as voiced by independent testimony.

LET US contrast with Dr. Mott's glowing picture the impressions of an English writer, Sir Henry Newman, whose personal knowledge of China is not surpassed by that of any European. "I believe it to be strictly within the limits of truth," he writes, "to say that foreign missionary effort in China has been productive of more harm than good. Instead of serving as a link between Chinese and foreigners the missionaries form a growing obstacle." So far as to Protestant missions. But, he proceeds, "a careful distinction must be made between Roman Catholic and Protestant missionaries. The former, on the whole, enjoy far more consideration from the natives, as well as from foreigners, and the result of their work is, beyond question, much greater. The Roman Catholic missionary goes to China once for all; he adopts native dress, lives on native food, inhabits a native house, supports himself on the most meagre allowance from home, and is an example of the characteristics which are as essential to the eastern idea of priesthood as to the western—poverty, chastity and obedience. To borrow the words of Sir William Hunter, 'he has cut himself off from the world by a solemn act.'" In other words he has given himself up unreservedly to the cause of his Master.

LEST READERS might conclude from those words that Sir Henry Newman takes a one-sided view, he is careful to add: "I am not prejudiced in favor of the Roman Catholic propaganda; yet I should not be honest if I did not say that for the personal character and work of many a Roman Catholic missionary whom I have met in China, I have conceived a profound respect. The Protestant missionary, on the other hand, in a majority of cases, looks upon his work as a career. He proposes to devote a certain part of his life to it, and then to return home with the halo of a Christian pioneer. In most cases he has his comfortable home, his wife, his children, his servants and his foreign food, and it is stated even that his stipend increases with each addition to his family. For his doctrines he is virtually responsible to nobody."

TESTIMONY SUCH as this abounds. It is the theme of every European official and traveller in China. What the writer just quoted says is, indeed, extremely wild. Yet with the unimpaired auditor of the average missionary lecturer in Canada it does not weigh in the balance with the bombast and egotism of speakers of the Mott type, whose conception of missionary zeal is to carry people off their feet by the extravagance of their utterances and by appeals to the temporal interests of their hearers who, in the glow of their enthusiasm, fail to distinguish the veritable gold brick that in many cases is being dealt out to them. Business is good Christianity and Christianity is good business—that is the burden of their cry, and the marvel is how sensible and well-meaning people, whose religious belief, real as it undoubtedly is, so far as it goes, can be carried along with it and even be brought to loudly applaud when John R. Mott is proclaimed as "the commander in chief

of the missionary forces of the world," and "the leader of the world-wide aggressive forces of the Christian religion." In face of this the venerable occupant of the See of Peter—the spiritual father of the only missionaries who have made any impression upon the heathen world—must needs bow his head. John R. Mott has the floor: great is Diana of the Ephesians!

MISSION OF THE CATHOLIC LAITY

ADDRESS BY HIS LORDSHIP BISHOP FALLON, AT THE WESTERN CATHOLIC BANQUET, WINNIPEG

Following is as accurate a stenographic report as could be obtained under the circumstances. The repeated applause made it impossible at times to catch His Lordship's exact words.—Northwest Review.

The Catholic laity, as a body, has rights, duties, and responsibilities outside of its religious obligations. They are members of the Church, but they are citizens as well. These obligations can be fulfilled by them alone; and in speaking of the Catholic who fulfills his obligations I can assure you that he is one who realizes that he is the child of the Catholic Church, and at the same time a citizen of the state, and who is unflinchingly loyal to both.

LOYALTY

There has been a little said about loyalty here to night. Why of course Your Grace, it is a late day for us to be taught a lesson in loyalty by anybody; and it is especially an inopportune moment when loyalists of the Sir Edward Carson type are drilling on the plains of Ulster to resist the authority of parliament and of the King. That is enough about loyalty. If I were not occupying my present exalted and distinguished position I would say that this talk about loyalty is not only insulting but it makes me sick.

What the Catholic layman must understand is that mutual concord of Church and State has always been, and ever must be for the interests of both, and that from the relative rights and duties of the Church and State and of the Catholic citizen there is no possible escape; that in a Catholic country such concord cannot be other than efficient, and that the promotion of the spiritual interests of the people is quite within the domain of the secular authority. The highest form that concord could reach, the noblest expression of that mutual relationship between Church and State would be when in every question where the spiritual interests of men were concerned the state would defer to the guidance and direction of religion.

Now, I am not talking theology. I am talking commonsense and reason. For Church and State, whether you like it or not, must live together. That Church and State should be separate is just as unnatural a condition as the husband and wife divorced. It is always better, in my view, though my experience is somewhat limited, to live together and to avoid the troubles which follow the divorce court. In my country and in my experience there has been harmonious concord between Church and State which works to the benefit of both. It falls short of the highest ideal, indeed, but it is moral. History tells us that that concord has worked for the highest benefit of civil powers and for the sublime work of the spiritual interests. Under such unity the State assumes frankly the Catholic teaching as the basis of its jurisdiction and that is nothing at all extraordinary because all legislation in the Dominion and Great Britain as well as all nations from the day of Paul, when law was first organized to the present day, is based upon Catholic teaching. I am attempting to lay down the principle upon which we must instruct the Catholic laity in this Canada of ours. We don't want the American system. I told you if you were not pleased you could get your money back. There is no room in the Catholic Church for spineless Catholics: no room for jellyfish Catholics; no room for men who have no backbone, and there is no room for a Catholic who is always apologizing; there is no room among our self-respecting separated brethren except for the type of Catholic who has something backing every action which he wishes to put forth and who puts into practice the law of marriage in such a condition as I am attempting to outline. The law of God is identical with the marriage law of the Church. The State exercises a wise control over the publication of books, and over the pernicious influence of the printing presses. The Catholic Church carefully provides that the education of Catholic children shall be fundamentally and suitably Catholic, safeguarding the rights of the Catholic parents and respecting the conscience of the Catholic citizen. Church and State, both created by God, in a different sense but really of supernatural destiny, work jointly for the benefit of the world. "What does it profit a man if he gain the whole world and suffer the loss of his own soul?"

SELF-GOVERNMENT

The Catholic laity have also rights, duties and responsibilities with regard to the function of the civil government. Self-government is our boast. We are always talking about it. I wonder if the term is understood.

Self-government is of two sorts. It is political and it is administrative.

In other words it is national and it is individual. The political self-government consists in the power of a nation to choose its own form of government; but the administrative form, the individual form of self-government, consists in the right of men to govern themselves, saving of course the rights of other men. The form of government is a matter of indifference. It may be despotic in form and yet quite free in operation; and it may be extraordinarily democratic in form and quite the opposite in operation.

It is a long time since the people of Great Britain have had the opportunity of choosing their form of government. They have grown up under a constitutional monarchy, and God grant that they may long continue to go on under that form of government. While they have not had much opportunity of choosing their political, their national form of government, Great Britain is a nation where the administrative government is very wide and where the citizen has very many unrestricted rights. Well may he say that his conscience is his own, that the direction of his actions belongs to himself and that his home is his castle!

A CONTRAST

Across the channel, only an hour's journey, is the Republic of France. Many times in the past hundred years the people of France have had an opportunity of choosing their political form of government. They have had kings, emperors, presidents. They have had kingdoms, republics and empires. They have a republican now. They have a wide and frequent choice of the form of their political government. From all these changes, as you all know, have emerged a certain form of government. In that administrative form of political freedom the right of the individual is controlled by a bureaucracy with headquarters in Paris and which extends its circumference to the smallest villages and hamlets of that great land. So that it will not do for us to talk about the advantages of self-government unless we know what we are talking about. Most modern nations that are least governed are best governed; and yet there is a large school of orators, philosophers, statesmen and thinkers who seek to extend the jurisdiction of the State to every activity of life; and strange to say, these very advocates of the destruction of individual freedom are the loudest talkers about popular liberty. They say that the government is obliged to supply every one with work and direct every action of the people, and therefore it is not tyranny to over-ride the individual in his work or to control the intent of his action. That is a return to paganism. It is a dead straight plunge into paganism. The intrinsic fundamental idea of the pagan state was its own omnipotence. Rome absorbed every energy of its citizens so that itself might become great. There indeed you have the cause of its greatness, but at the same time the germ of its decay. The Christian ideal is the responsibility, the freedom of the man. All the great nations of the world owe their present greatness to individual freedom all down the ages. From the days of servitude and vassalage the Catholic Church and the Pope of Rome upheld that ideal and it is an admitted fact that even in our days when socialism, nihilism and anarchism are trying to overturn and destroy the only power that stands on its feet is the power of Rome, the power of the Roman Catholic Church. Man is free and responsible where such government thoroughly exists. You can't substitute for the responsibility of the individual the responsibility of the State. When Louis XIV. declared "L'etat, c'est moi" he wrote the first sentence in the history of the ruin of France, and he made the revolution not only easy but inevitable.

UNDoubtedly there is something very enticing when you consider the strength of the State in your own service. Of course the State is so big and the individual so small, the State is so great the individual so weak, the State so active and the individual so indolent. But if you permit—and I assume that I am talking to men and women who have the tradition of the freedom under which they have been brought up—when you permit the State to take any part in the individual labor on the ground that the State is doing something that you are too tired to do you are committing a crime against humanity. We must remember that the moment we court the favor of the State we are surrendering a portion of our personal liberty. The government has nothing to give back to the people which it has not first taken from them. You cannot get away from that political axiom. You will not hear that very frequently from the hustings, but it is a fact. The government has nothing to give back to a free people that it has not first taken from them, and the best kind of government all through the ages has necessarily been chained and bound in fetters for the freedom of the individual. The Catholic laity—and here I must step on the soft pedal—the Catholic laity have to be on its guard against the dangers of party politics. And since I do not make any distinction between parties (I include the Socialist party, the labor party, as well as other parties) I cannot be accused of talking politics. The Catholic laity have to be careful of the dangers of party politics. Those parties resolve themselves ultimately into a question of expenditure. "We will give you more service and less taxes" is the univer-

sal program of every political party, and as hopes and promises are incompatible the hopes are dashed and the promises are unrealized. Let me tell you that taxes and philanthropy are identical. The party in power is besieged for favors. If they are refused, it is turned out of office. If it succeeds this must come and say taxes. When people come and say give us credit, give us education, give us colonies according to your promises and still keep down the taxes, the party in power goes out and the party out of power comes in.

ESSENTIAL PRINCIPLES

There has been more and more party politics since the day when Abel divided on the first question. Now in the face of these conditions the essential principle and that is the full preservation of the rights of the people that belong to the people themselves, the preservation of justice; and from the obligation that rests upon the state of living up to that conviction follows its rights and its duties; it must allow at all times the free development of society under individual initiative; it must protect the citizens in the exercise of their rights and mutual obligations without replacing the responsibility of the individual by the responsibility of the state; it must allow to every one the fullness of his rights limited only by the rule that such exercise does not invade the rights of others. The Catholic laity have a noble mission regarding personal liberty. Now, I don't know whether I have lost my mind; I tell you I have not lost my mind. Of course I may be like the gentleman who was met by the late Sir John Macdonald in an institution in my native city. Sir John was going through an asylum when he met an old friend and he said "Hello, how are you? What's the matter with you?" Well, Sir John, said the old man, "the people say I am crazy, but I say the people are crazy." Now on this question of personal liberty I want to strike a note. Defend it at whatever cost. It is the proudest boast of a free people. St. Augustine has said: "In things that are necessary we have unity, in things that are unessential or doubtful there must be liberty, but in all things there ought to be charity." It was some time later that that great saint, Saint Columbanus said: "When you take away liberty from man by the same blow you destroy his human dignity." And it is St. Thomas who said: "The exercise of the free will of man is the noblest attribute of his nature by which he excels the beast, makes him equal to the angels, and in a certain sense like unto God himself."

AN INTERFERENCE

Forcing men to be good is an interference with the exercise of individual free will, and yet there seems to be in courts and legislatures, and worst of all in the people themselves, a tendency to discourage the fundamental principle of personal liberty, the right of the individual citizen to live and act as he thinks best so long as his conduct does not invade a like privilege on the part of others. There is a great decline in personal liberty in this century. There is a mania for regulating everything by statute. See how it works out.

Intemperance is a curse, therefore they would prohibit it by law, making men good by legislation—an interference plain and evident with individual liberty and injurious not so much to itself as in its effects. It is not so long ago that an erratic statesman of modern times, who said that poverty was a disgrace and a curse, decided therefore that he should introduce a law to suppress pawn shops.

PROTECTOR OF LIBERTY

The Catholic laity need to stand up for the freedom of the middle ages, for the freedom of the individual and society and against revolution and the tyranny of majorities. The Catholic Church has always been the protector of liberty in all the ages. It was Catholic barons with a Catholic Bishop at their head that forced from unwilling King John the charter of British Liberty, and the charter of British Liberty is Catholic to the core.

Now some time ago I had an occasion to deliver an address in my own city in which, using my personal liberty—which I don't propose to let anybody interfere with—I gave utterance to the belief and the hope that some way would be found where by the scattered elements of the British Empire would be held together for the best interests of us all and for the benefit of ages to come. It was called Imperialism. I don't care a straw what you call it. But at once two most startling things happened. A section of the A. O. H. read me out of the Catholic Church and a section of my fellow countrymen and fellow Catholics amongst the French Canadians initiated me into the Orange Association. Now I have no more idea of allowing any section of the A. O. H. to read me out of the Catholic Church than I have to let the other people put me into the Orange Association. The mistake made by both sections is that they did not understand that I believe and hold that my personal liberty justifies the expression of my own opinions. I am sure that there is not a nation under the sun where the Catholic Church is so free as under the British flag, and that there is not any other country where the traditions of the Catholic Church under Magna Charta have come down so pure and undisturbed as under this great nation, and therefore, I am an Imperialist almost exclusively because I am a loving, de-

voted, humble, undeserving son of Holy Mother Church.

FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION

The necessary complement of liberty is the fullness of freedom of association. The individual cannot obtain, by his own effort, all the things that he needs for his intellectual or even for his physical development; but he can obtain these things by association. Freedom of association is something that is so common with us under British rule that it is scarcely observed and yet it is something so little known in other countries, that it should be referred to. It is the very basis and complement of individual liberty to which the laity are obliged to uphold. The different societies of the Church need that freedom of association more than anything else. The Catholic Church can help the government by her public and charitable organizations and associations, but assistance should be mutual.

These are the principles that must govern and direct the Catholic laity and they must be fulfilled in this and other countries. It is in view of these principles and in view of her history here and everywhere else that we should proclaim them. What has the Catholic Church done to the world that so many are constantly reviling her? Can you tell me what evils she has accomplished? She has been the constant foe of every evil, she is the only power recognized by Socialism as her triumphant foe, she has been the incarnation of works of charity beyond number and she is the mother of science, sculpture and the arts. She has been the benefactor of society since the very beginning of her history.

WHAT THE CHURCH EXPECTS

Now, what does the Catholic Church expect from her laity? What does she expect from her children placed in high offices? What does she expect of her Fitzpatricks, and her Lauriers, her Dohertys, her Murphys, her Berniers, and of her Turgons. Your Grace, does she ask any favor? Is she seeking for any privileges? No! there is not the slightest danger. But what we want of our laity is, that in private life, they reverence their conscience as their king; that they glory in redressing wrongs; and in public life carry unspotted the white flower of a blameless life. The Catholic layman who does not live up to that standard is not worthy of the confidence of his own people, but the Catholic individual who does is worthy of the confidence of his fellow-citizens of every creed to the utmost limit.

The Catholic Church holds up before her laity examples of what Catholic laymen have been in all ages. But I shall not bring you back to the graves of past ages. I shall refer to examples in the memory of most men. I shall bring you to Ecuador. Not more than fifty years ago a Catholic statesman named Garcia Moreno entered public life to protect the people in their liberty, to defend their religion, and to stand up for the principle of sound education. He lived a life of glory and he died at the hands of an assassin on the steps of a public building. Alone amongst the rulers of all nations, Garcia Moreno protested against the spoliation of the papal states by Victor Emmanuel, and when he died a memorial was erected to him and on that memorial may be found these words: "He was a man of most constant religion, he was a promoter of the ideal form of education, he was most loyal and devoted towards the See of Peter, a champion of justice, the foe of oppression." Garcia Moreno gave to his nation and to all nations of the world the grandest example that could possibly be given.

Over the Spain Donoso Cortes in his early years joined a society which persecuted Mother Church but about middle age he saw the error of his ways, and declared that the opinions which he had hitherto held were destructive of good government. In later years he wrote a book in which he made amends and which has given him the right to be named a prophet of the nineteenth century.

In France, Frederic Ozanam, the founder of the society of St. Vincent de Paul, is held up as an example to Catholic laymen. Immersed in business occupations he still found time to devote his great energies towards the relief of the poor and forsaken and his memory is cherished because

of his large humanity, self-sacrifice and practical Christian charity. In Germany, Ludwig Windthorst, a dwarf in stature but a giant in political vision, crossed swords with the Imperial Chancellor in the house of representatives and, by his indomitable logic and courage, forged the great Bismark to own himself beaten and to repeal the infamous May laws.

THE IDEAL LAYMAN

But I think that it is elsewhere that we must look for the ideal layman. Some years ago there was an old colored gentleman in St. Paul, attending a celebration in honor of Daniel O'Connell where a number of addresses were delivered, one of them by John of St. Paul, the apostle of the American Northwest, and at the end this old darky came forward and said: "Gentlemen, I am no speaker but I can tell you something that none of you know. I was in the British House of Parliament a certain day when I saw a great lion-like figure come in and as he appeared Lord John Russell sat down and Daniel O'Connell stood up. And I tell you when John Russell sat down England sat down and when Daniel O'Connell stood up Ireland stood up." Leaving prejudice and nationality aside, it is in Ireland that the Catholic Church will present for your study and admiration and for your guidance in life the greatest Catholic layman. Montalambert said so. Lacordaire compared him to Moses. To Peter the Hermit, to Gregory the Great. But one aspect only of this Catholic layman will I touch upon. It was when he came back to Ireland in his twenty-first year having obtained in France—generous, kind, considerate France—the education denied to him at home, he took up the cause of the larger freedom of his countrymen and for thirty years or more he stood in the forefront of the battle, sometimes with fretful supporters, sometimes with divided ranks, sometimes with a united army and compelled the greatest nation of modern times to do justice to his fellowmen. Elected for County Clare, when he appeared for the first time in the British Commons, he was presented with the oath. Reading it over slowly and carefully he said: "One part of this oath as a matter of fact I know to be false, and the other part as a matter of opinion I believe to be untrue." Turning from the bar he strode majestically from the chamber. A bye-election was declared in Clare and O'Connell was returned, but in the meantime the oath had been altered. From that moment the British Commons resounded with his eloquence. The rights of the people had a fearless champion and one whom no reverses could discourage. Daniel O'Connell is without doubt an ideal to be ever cherished—as an example for every Catholic layman to imitate. God give you a Garcia Moreno, a Donoso Cortes, a Frederic Ozanam, a Ludwig Windthorst and a Daniel O'Connell.

Our Angel is our oldest friend—an older friend even than Mary, for she became our friend at our baptism, while our Angel has been our friend from our entrance into the world.—Bishop Curtis.

He who knows how to laugh, when to laugh, and what to laugh at, has achieved a philosophy all his own.

Life, to be worthy of a rational being, must be always in progression.—Johnson.

The voice of the many is no test of truth, nor warrant of right, nor rule of duty.

THE DECORATION of CHURCHES

Stands apart from any everyday Domestic Decoration

THE Thornton-Smith Co.

recognize this and have for years past given up a special studio and staff to ecclesiastical decoration. They are experts in any matter of mural decoration, and ask to be consulted as such.

11 King St. West, Toronto

of his large humanity, self-sacrifice and practical Christian charity. In Germany, Ludwig Windthorst, a dwarf in stature but a giant in political vision, crossed swords with the Imperial Chancellor in the house of representatives and, by his indomitable logic and courage, forged the great Bismark to own himself beaten and to repeal the infamous May laws.

THE IDEAL LAYMAN

But I think that it is elsewhere that we must look for the ideal layman. Some years ago there was an old colored gentleman in St. Paul, attending a celebration in honor of Daniel O'Connell where a number of addresses were delivered, one of them by John of St. Paul, the apostle of the American Northwest, and at the end this old darky came forward and said: "Gentlemen, I am no speaker but I can tell you something that none of you know. I was in the British House of Parliament a certain day when I saw a great lion-like figure come in and as he appeared Lord John Russell sat down and Daniel O'Connell stood up. And I tell you when John Russell sat down England sat down and when Daniel O'Connell stood up Ireland stood up." Leaving prejudice and nationality aside, it is in Ireland that the Catholic Church will present for your study and admiration and for your guidance in life the greatest Catholic layman. Montalambert said so. Lacordaire compared him to Moses. To Peter the Hermit, to Gregory the Great. But one aspect only of this Catholic layman will I touch upon. It was when he came back to Ireland in his twenty-first year having obtained in France—generous, kind, considerate France—the education denied to him at home, he took up the cause of the larger freedom of his countrymen and for thirty years or more he stood in the forefront of the battle, sometimes with fretful supporters, sometimes with divided ranks, sometimes with a united army and compelled the greatest nation of modern times to do justice to his fellowmen. Elected for County Clare, when he appeared for the first time in the British Commons, he was presented with the oath. Reading it over slowly and carefully he said: "One part of this oath as a matter of fact I know to be false, and the other part as a matter of opinion I believe to be untrue." Turning from the bar he strode majestically from the chamber. A bye-election was declared in Clare and O'Connell was returned, but in the meantime the oath had been altered. From that moment the British Commons resounded with his eloquence. The rights of the people had a fearless champion and one whom no reverses could discourage. Daniel O'Connell is without doubt an ideal to be ever cherished—as an example for every Catholic layman to imitate. God give you a Garcia Moreno, a Donoso Cortes, a Frederic Ozanam, a Ludwig Windthorst and a Daniel O'Connell.

Our Angel is our oldest friend—an older friend even than Mary, for she became our friend at our baptism, while our Angel has been our friend from our entrance into the world.—Bishop Curtis.

He who knows how to laugh, when to laugh, and what to laugh at, has achieved a philosophy all his own.

Life, to be worthy of a rational being, must be always in progression.—Johnson.

The voice of the many is no test of truth, nor warrant of right, nor rule of duty.

Capital Trust Corporation, Limited

Authorized Capital \$2,000,000

FOUR PER CENT. SAVINGS. Our Corporation is paying 4% interest every three months calculated on the daily balance on all Savings Accounts, and allows withdrawal by cheque when required.

OUT OF TOWN CUSTOMERS may mail us their deposits. Send Post Office Order, Express Order or Cheque. We invite your account.

Offices: 29 Sparks St., Ottawa, Ont.

M. J. O'BRIEN, President. B. G. CONNOLLY, Managing Director.

Send for Booklet describing our other departments.