

JUNE 14, 1919

tion of God is more than unity. He will grant certain interior relations in the Divine Essence which belong to a living being. "God is Love," and that love is co-eternal, co-existing and co-infinite with God Himself. In the idea of God as embodied in the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity is the unity of nature and God and at the same time the trinity of the unity.

That there must be unity in the divine trinity is evident, since there can be but one infinite, namely, one God. More than one infinite is a contradiction. Hence any objection to this doctrine starts with a false premise, and inevitably leads to false conclusions that Trinity means one God and three Gods, or that one is three and three are one, which is not only unreasonable, but a contradiction and intrinsically impossible.

What, then, in God is thought and love are interior relations essential to the conception of unity as one Living God, while this idea of God as trinity is essential to the conception of God as one living unity.

God is love. From all eternity He loved. The object of that love must be different from the faculty of loving. Every faculty bears with itself an essential relation, and the relation supposes a double term, namely, principal and medium, or the one acting and the other acted upon. The same applies to thinking. Thoughts are the product of the intellect. Therefore they are distinct from the intellect. To think one must think something, and that something must be and is distinct from the faculty of thinking. A man's intellect when thinking is different from the same intellect when not thinking, and yet the difference in the same intellect is the thought of the thinking intellect. Edison thinking in his laboratory has a different intellect from that which he has when in a passive state. In the former state the intellect is hard at work, revolving thoughts as to some new discovery, and the means to attain it. These thoughts constitute a difference in the same intellect.

In God, who is not merely abstract unity, the faculty of loving and thinking must exist, and these faculties must be of the same nature with God, namely, infinite, or in other words, God himself. Yet the object of His thoughts must be distinct from the faculty itself, since it is impossible for a faculty to exercise its action on itself. The object must be outside of itself. All this is reasonable, and the very nature of the Divinity requires it. It contains a full explanation of the orthodox teaching of the Blessed Trinity, namely, three persons in one God, the Father begetting from all eternity His Son, whom He loves and by whom He is loved, producing thereby the Holy Ghost, who proceeds from both Father and Son. The Blessed Trinity is the fundamental principle of the Catholic faith. Its denial in the orthodox sense is a denial of Christianity. In its Name the Infant is born again, hence the form used in baptism is, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Are not the three persons distinctly marked?

The fact that this belief has always existed is a proof that God has revealed a Blessed Trinity, since natural reason could find no trace of God as Holy Trinity in the whole order of creation. In fact, then, what the human race has always believed that God is three distinct persons in one substance, is proof that the Blessed Trinity is a revealed truth.—F. D. in Intermountain Catholic.

## THEATRE'S MORAL UPLIFT

The Catholic Church in America under the leadership of Cardinal Farley has been doing a great deal in the direction of discountenancing the immoral or suggestive tendencies of the stage. The Knights of Columbus all over the country have been aiding this clean-up movement and the most effective weapon used has been the withdrawal of decent patronage, which made itself felt in the box office receipts.

Yet the Catholic Church has always been a defender of the play, which carries a respectable entertainment and a moral lesson. She has acknowledged from the earliest days the power of the stage for good or evil, and that its preaching reaches many of the masses and has a dominating influence over them.

But several of the Protestant sects have entertained a derogatory or contrary view. They were narrow-minded enough to denounce the stage, whether its plays were for good or evil. In this connection it is interesting and commendable to note that they are changing front, and adopting the sound views on the subject of the Catholic Church.

Perhaps the most unrelenting enemy of the theatre was the Methodist Episcopal church; but its position has recently been very much modified. While the general conferences has so far refused to rescind the condemnation of attendance at theatrical exhibitions, it is significant to remark that at a recent annual conference in New Haven, Conn., Prof. Henry Wade Rogers emphatically expressed his disapproval of the rule in the Book of Discipline, which puts under formal ban the practice of theatre-going.

Protestant sects have been obliged at last to concede the wholesome influence of certain plays, which have had a successful run in some of the greater cities of the United States.

Among these are enumerated "The Servant in the House," "The Passing of the Third Floor Back" and "The Dawn of Tomorrow." But there are other plays of moral influence, such as "The Sign of the Cross," "Down East," etc., several of them with a distinctively Catholic theme and coloring. It is acknowledged by Protestant leaders and divines that this class of plays "should have recognition of those who stand for higher life of the community and that the general position of Christians should be one, not of total abstinence but of wise discrimination." Nor is it less emphasized that the theatre is vindicating its right to be counted not simply as an educational agency, but as an agency making for righteousness and social justice.

And so a writer in one of the Protestant journals adopts the following, largely Catholic view, on the same subject:

"That the theatre renders this ministry in its own way, different from the way of organized religion, is a distinct advantage, for it makes an appeal to multitudes whom the Church and kindred movements seldom if ever reach. There never was needed more than to-day the spirit of just discrimination in the judgment passed upon the theatre by the Church. That which is corrupt in it should be unqualifiedly condemned. Plays that are a stimulus to the nostrils of decency should be driven to cover by an aroused public sentiment. But just as truly should the good and uplifting receive the support and encouragement of good men. It ought to become more and more profitable to serve the public with that which elevates taste and ministers to the creation of ideals. It ought to be made financially hazardous to attempt anything else. The theatre is the public servant, not its master. It caters to public demands. It thrives on the public's purse. We, the public, may have what we want, when we want it, and when we are ready to pay the price for it, not in coin, but in discrimination, in the condemnation of the evil, in sympathetic support of the good. The problem is by no means uniform. The size, character, ideals and spirit of the local community are vital factors involved. Still, any community which has enough of religion and morality to support schools and churches can also unite in the creation and support of healthful amusement for all of its citizens."

Surely Catholic Bishops and priests and laymen will agree that it is far better for the Church to bring all its influence to bear against objectionable and immoral plays than to countenance a tirade against the theatre as such. In fact, she is ever ready to encourage the good and moral on the stage and to aid members of the theatrical profession and workers for social betterment, who are striving for the uplift of the American stage.—Intermountain Catholic.

## OSLER AND CARDINAL GIBBONS

Sir William Osler, the famous physician, whose textbook is largely used in our medical schools, and who some time ago made a statement in regard to the utter uselessness of men in this world after they had attained the age of sixty, has evidently reached in his sixty-fourth year the condition of impaired faculties, which he treated so severely in the course of an address delivered by him at the recent dedicatory exercises of the new Phipps Psychiatric clinic, John Hopkins hospital, Baltimore, he went out of his way to give a contemptible slap in the face to the Catholic Church after this fashion:

"Primitive views will prevail everywhere of man's relation to the world and to the uncharted region about him. So recent is the control of the forces of nature that even in the most civilized countries man has not yet adjusted himself to the new conditions, and stands only half awake, rubbing his eyes outside of Eden. Still in the thumaturgic state of our mental development 90 per cent. of our fellow creatures, when in trouble, sorrow or sickness, trust to charms, incantations, and to the saints. Many a shrine has more followers than Paster: many a saint more believers than Lister. Less than twenty years have passed since the last witch was burned in the British Isles!"

"Mentally the race is still in leading strings, and it has only been in the last brief epoch of its history that Esop and Lewis Carroll have spun yarns for its delight, and its follies. In the childhood of the world we cannot expect people yet to put away childish things. These, Mr. President, are some of the hopes which fill our hearts as we think of the future of this new department."

In thus complimenting science and men of science to the detriment of religion and its exponents Dr. Osler made a grave mistake—and he forgot that one of the most eminent scientists—Paster:—was a sincere and devout Catholic, who made it his life work to bring religion and science together—to have their principles and developments in harmony with each other.

It was no wonder, therefore, that his Eminence Cardinal Gibbons arose to the defense of the Faith of our Fathers, in the following reply to the censorious physician:

"I find that scientists in any line sometimes make statements such as that of Dr. Osler, and only a short time ago I had to defend some truths

that Thomas A. Edison attacked. The great trouble with these scientific specialists is that they cannot imagine how anyone can disagree with them. They think their statements should go unchallenged, but this one of Dr. Osler can be challenged. I shall write to him asking him to retract it. I would like to call the attention of Dr. Osler to the fact that Paster: was a devoted Catholic, and put his trust in the saints. He said that as his knowledge of medicine increased his faith grew likewise. He was proud of the fact that he was a member of the Catholic Church, and I am sure he worshipped at many shrines. What do the things that Dr. Osler preaches stand for, anyhow? Fifty years ago all his teachings may be overturned by new discoveries. His whole doctrine is based on theory. Fifty years ago the scientists of that day imagined they knew all that was to be known of medicine, yet to-day their conclusions are overturned by later discoveries.

"The statements attributed to Dr. Osler are an attack on Christianity. I am exceedingly surprised that he should make such attacks in this age. The Catholic Church is not founded on theory and whereas the whole world is informed of the doctrines, the conclusions of Dr. Osler are known to comparatively few. The world at present is alarmed by the condition of the head of the Church, and changes in his health are of great interest—more, perhaps, than that of any scientist whom we now know."

Dr. Osler ought to be excused on account of the limitations which he placed upon the usefulness of men after they have reached sixty. We hope that he is not an illustration of the general truth he propounded as to the uselessness of men of his age.—Intermountain Catholic.

## PROTESTANTISM'S SUBSTITUTE FOR SAINTS

The Protestant Reformers were great abolitionists; they promised themselves the abolition of all sorts of things the Pope purgatory, indulgences, sacred images, sacraments, saints and much besides. In the case of the Pope the procedure was to be by the methods of division; infallibility was thenceforth to reside in everybody—everybody, that is to say, who did not remain Catholic: for a judgment that should happen to coincide with that of the Pope and of the some hundreds of millions of Christians still adhering to the Pope, however private, could never claim the noble prerogatives of real privacy.

In the case of the saints there arose another sort of substitute. Instead of saints the reformed churches plumed themselves on Worthies, Luther, Calvin, Melancthon, Zwingli and the rest of them were not set up as saints and no one can be greatly surprised. The title of saint had, in the course of 1,500 years, acquired a meaning so definite that to apply it to any of those personages would have suggested comparisons—proverbially odious. And the meaning of the word saint was not one acceptable to the Reformers. In the first place, all the saints had from immemorial time been singularly Catholic. Differing immensely in personal characteristics, in worldly rank, in education in natural tastes, in a thousand other ways, they had all been distinguished by a peculiar loyalty to the Catholic faith and to the visible head of the Church, that was both Catholic and Roman Catholic in universality, as opposed to nationality or localism, and Roman as having the Bishop of Rome for its supreme earthly head and Rome as its metropolis and central seat of government and authority. The saints, too, had been persistently "Roman Catholic" in other ways, as they had shown by their prayers and their pious practices. They went to confession, they heard Mass, they adored the Divine Sacrament of the Eucharist, they wore the shackle of the Blessed Sacrament, they venerated sacred relics and images; they went on pilgrimages to holy places; they loved and glorified Christ's Mother, and made hymns in honor of her and her unique prerogative; they sought her intercession and that of the martyrs and other great servants of God. Many of them were monks or nuns; many of them had actually been Popes. They used great austerities on their own bodies; they bound themselves by vows to perpetual chastity, to religious obedience and religious poverty. They did worse than all this, for they wrought miracles in life and after death. English or French, Spanish or Italian, German or African, they were all alike in being intolerably and incurably Catholic; mere Papists all of them. It was inevitable that the reformers should dislike and miscall them. For centuries these canonized Popes and Cardinals, Bishops, abbots, monks, nuns and so on, had been keeping alive the wicked superstition that the Catholic Church is the home and house of sanctity. The reformers did not like either them or their sanctity; in the reformed churches they should have no home, and they never have had. So far these abolitionists have been as good as their word; the old-fashioned sanctity did not, indeed, obey the proclamation that it was to die out. Saints of the original type and quality went on appearing; the Reformation period produced a singularly notable group of them, as heroic as ever, as supernatural, as inexplicable by human standards and logic. But the new

saints did not swarm in the new hives of reformed Christianity. It was not in any one of the new religious bodies that they showed themselves; but they went on blossoming on the old tree that had always borne them, just as if the dropping off of dead and rotten boughs had made no difference. No complaint can reasonably be made of the Reformation Churches' peculiar objection to the Post-Reformation saints, for the Post-Reformation saints proved themselves, one and all, peculiarly opposed to the Reformation doctrines and ideals.

## NO REFORMATION SAINTS

If saints of the old sort have continued to appear in the old Church, the Reformers have not been troubled by anything of the kind within their own gates. So far they have succeeded; without precisely abolishing sanctity, the superstitious sanctity so obnoxious in Papal religion, they have kept their own ranks quite clear of it. There have been no Reformation saints, which would seem almost a providential circumstance, as it would be hard to decide whose business it would have been, had any supervised, to canonize them. The Church of England produced a royal martyr, but poor Charles I. was never much revered by overseas Protestants, and his cult, even at home, was chiefly confined to a venerable political party now equally defunct with himself. Those who did not belong to that party seem to have thought that even cutting off that head could never put much into it, and that the martyr to some extent fell a victim to his unlucky predilection for telling fibs. He was not, at all events, our martyr, and it does not concern us to be "Advocates Diaboli" or "Promoters Cause"; but I would wish to say frankly, that I for my part do not ascribe the king's execution to his faults, but to the ambition and hypocrisy of his enemies. That he was a saint I do not believe; that he was better than nine-tenths of the Protestant worthies I do firmly believe. Had he been a saint I doubt whether either Lord or Strafford would have been beheaded. That he and they died very nobly no enemy of theirs has ever tried to deny. Charles I. and Laud were not by any means Protestant "worthies," but they were among the best of the Anglican.

## REAL PROTESTANT WORTHIES

Real Protestant worthies were creatures like the unspeakable Knox, and the really disreputable Burnet; but out of Scotland the former has never been admired, and even in England the latter has long been recognized as a conscienceless time-serving courtier and sycophant who would have been glad to play Crammer to Charles II's Henry VIII, had that too much decried scapegrace been willing to descend to such infamy as the royal author of the Reformation in England unblushingly perpetrated. Tillotson was a worthy too, and the Archbishop of Canterbury was a far better man than the Bishop of Salisbury; but even the benches of Lincoln's Inn, whose chaplain he was in 1664, complained that "since Mr. Tillotson came Jesus Christ has not been preached among us." If he was not Christian enough even for a corporation of Restoration lawyers his Christianity must have been vague indeed. Still it was enough to plant him on the throne of St. Augustine, St. Anselm and St. Thomas a Becket in the time of Charles II. Charles was no more either to him or Burnet, but in that of the Prince of Orange, another Protestant worthy and patron-worthy of all Protestants in Ireland to this day. If ever Protestantism could have longed to canonize any one William of Orange would have been the man, though whether the process would have been carried out by the States General of Holland, the Parliament of England, or the Orange lodges of Ireland no one can now determine. Henry VIII. and his daughter Elizabeth, of virgin memory, have always been regarded as Protoworthies by the full-blooded Protestant, by whom the elder monarch's bluff audities have never been counted to him for unrighteousness, who can never perceive that he was simply a bad and villainous Catholic, and that Elizabeth was merely a skeptical autocrat with no idea of permitting in her realms any religion she could not carry in her own pocket. Father and daughter hanged priests, tried to lay the Pope under an interdict; so they are Protestant worthies, and entitled to the smug halo of the same. The royal triad is completed by Edward VI, also a worthy, in addition to being an anemic prig, which Protestant worthies usually are not.

## THEIR FONDNESS FOR PIRATICAL ENTERPRISE

But the race is not confined to princely personages and Erastian Bishops. Hardly deserves a name call the age in which literature, art and science flourished the golden age of Leo X.?" "Why? Because Leo X. was an ardent admirer of classic literature and a magnanimous patron of the arts and science?" "You don't say! Leo, a Pope, and at the same time took a great interest in fine arts. Well, I declare!" "It seems to me, fellow, you are fooling me." "Not at all! Those are only doubts, intolerable doubts. I would kick against the monks if I had reasons, but these doubts do not let me rest. Now, professor, is it true that the first free schools were opened by De la Salle?" "Yes, by the Frenchman, De la Salle."

"I understand you mean to say by the Catholic priest De la Salle. And the first monk who cared for the deaf mutes was the Spaniard Pedro de Ponce and after him the priest LePeere?" "Yes, and now stop, you block-head!" "Don't get hot, professor. It is not our fault that history is full of these black devils. Moreover, I read that a monk by the name of Schwarz invented gunpowder; the monk Guide d'Arezzo the gamut and laid down the foundation for harmony; a monk from Bavaria the process for glass painting; the Jesuit Secchi is especially distinguished for his discoveries in spectroscopic analysis and in solar and stellar physics; the Jesuit—"

## THE PROFESSOR ENLIGHTENED—AND ANNOYED

### SCIENCE, ART, PROGRESS AND THE CLERGY

There was once a professor who used to close his lectures with the pathetic words: "Priests and monks are good for nothing; they always hated science, art and progress; their schools are poor and all the books published by Catholics are of no value, and when a young man cannot become anything else he studies for the priesthood."

One day, after school, a student by the name of Sepp called on the professor. Sepp was a bright and intelligent young fellow and could not be easily bluffed. He went to the professor's room and said gently: "Professor, I have some difficulties that worry me ever since I attended your lectures. Will you kindly help me to remove them?"

"Why not, dear friend, with the greatest of pleasure. Certainly I will."

"Only some questions, professor. Who preserved for us the classics? How is it possible that those valuable writings of the Greeks and Romans did not get lost during the barbarism of the Dark Ages?"

"Monks copied them, and thus they have been saved."

"What, professor? Monks, you say, copied them?"

"Yes, my friend, and especially the Benedictines."

"So, monks copied the old codes and saved them for us. Indeed, that must have been a very troublesome work. Was it not? And probably many a monk caught consumption from the library dust? Well, I am surprised. Strange times and curious monks to spend their lives copying letters after letters from Livy, Caesar, Cicero, Virgil, Ovid, Homer, Demosthenes, etc. And how those codes look! Carefully written just like printed and the initials are in fact a fine piece of art. Oh, these monks! Wait, professor, is it true that without the priests we would not have a Columbus and a Vasco da Gama? A monk, Fra Mauro, history tells us, made that costly map which gave Columbus the first impulse to the discovery of the New World?"

"It is true, but somebody else could have drawn such a map, too."

"Of course. Why should the monks and priests alone have those great ideas? Listen, professor. I also read that a Pope introduced the graceful Arabic figures in arithmetic and abolished those clumsy Roman characters."

"Well, my boy, Pope Sylvester II. introduced them, but somebody else could have done the same thing if the Popes were not always so ambitious."

"Again, history teaches that a monk invented the telescope and the microscope, but this hardly can be true? The monks want to claim all inventions."

"Well, my boy, it is believed by many authorities that the theory of both the telescope and microscope was known to the Franciscan Roger Bacon, but remember, he was an exception and what we style a 'modern' Franciscan, and not one of those bigots and cowards. He died in 1292."

"He, then, was up-to-date very early, wasn't he? Besides this, professor, not long ago I read of the man who first taught that the sun is stationary and that the earth revolves about the sun, and even you, professor, do not know whom I mean."

"Copernicus, I suppose."

"No, Sir. Copernicus was not the first one. Before him the Bishop of Ratisbon, Regiomontanus, was teaching that theory of planetary revolution."

"That may be possible."

"Excuse me, professor, why do we call the age in which literature, art and science flourished the golden age of Leo X.?"

"Why? Because Leo X. was an ardent admirer of classic literature and a magnanimous patron of the arts and science."

"You don't say! Leo, a Pope, and at the same time took a great interest in fine arts. Well, I declare!" "It seems to me, fellow, you are fooling me."

"Not at all! Those are only doubts, intolerable doubts. I would kick against the monks if I had reasons, but these doubts do not let me rest. Now, professor, is it true that the first free schools were opened by De la Salle?"

"Yes, by the Frenchman, De la Salle."

"I understand you mean to say by the Catholic priest De la Salle. And the first monk who cared for the deaf mutes was the Spaniard Pedro de Ponce and after him the priest LePeere?"

"Yes, and now stop, you block-head!" "Don't get hot, professor. It is not our fault that history is full of these black devils. Moreover, I read that a monk by the name of Schwarz invented gunpowder; the monk Guide d'Arezzo the gamut and laid down the foundation for harmony; a monk from Bavaria the process for glass painting; the Jesuit Secchi is especially distinguished for his discoveries in spectroscopic analysis and in solar and stellar physics; the Jesuit—"

"Shut up! You are geying me. Do not take me for a lightning rod."

"You're right, you're right, professor. The first lightning rod was not made by Franklin, but it was invented by the Premonstratensian monk Divisch. You can read that in any up-to-date cyclopedia."

"For heaven's sake, hold your tongue. You are too talkative."

"Ah, the greatest polyglot of modern times was Cardinal Mezzofanti. He was a talker! He knew only seventy-eight languages and dialects, and talked fifty-six."

"That'll do, you silly goose. Get out of here."

"In what direction? The deacon Flavia Gioja, who improved the compass about the year 1300, could certainly tell me."

"What's the matter? You're getting the brain fever, fellow."

"What, if I had the brain fever, go and get the fire engines which were first introduced by the Cistercian monks, and the Capuchins were down to the seventeenth century the first firemen of Paris."

"If you don't shut up now, you'll fly out the window, you infernal rascal."

"In aerial heights. Oh, truly. The first balloon was made by the monk Berthold Gismac sixty years before Montgolfieri, and in 1720 this monk ascended with his balloon in the presence of all the lords and courtiers of Portugal. What do you clean your eyeglasses for, professor? They are also an invention of the 'black devils' and were invented in the thirteenth century by the Dominican Alexander Spina. Are you in a hurry, that you look at your watch?"

"You shouldn't do that, because it is an invention of the priests. The first clock is from the ecclesiastical writer Cassiodorus (505), but his invention was improved upon by Sylvester II, whom I mentioned before. The first astronomical clock was made by Abbot Wallingford in 1316. Now I'll go. I see your hot, professor, and the gas lights downtown are turned on. Oh, yes, professor, I almost forgot to tell you that the Jesuits invented the gas light, the Jesuits this 'natio lucifuga.' With-out any doubt the Jesuits invented and introduced it in 1794 at Stonyhurst, England, and the Jesuit Dumma established the first gas company in 1815 in Preston. Now, goodbye, professor. Kindly excuse. Oh, I see you bought a new bicycle? By the way the first bicycle was built by the priest Planton in 1845. Good night, professor."—Truth.

## REVILING A VICTIM

In an article reproduced by the New York Freeman's Journal from the Fortnight Review (sic), C. E. Arnoux informs his readers that "for twenty-five years the French peasantry have had no sermons, no catechism classes; and when on occasions in large centres there was a sermon, it consisted of a transcendental excursion far above the heads of the audience. Or again, the preacher would read a printed sermon with such volubility of enunciation that the audience would usually leave a sigh of relief as he closed the book with a long drawn out: 'Amen'; probably the only word clearly uttered. Nor was reading of sermons confined to the rural districts." The Low Mass on Sunday was hurried through and the church was locked for the week. There were no Vespers and no Benediction, and no marriages in the church, for the reason that civil marriage sufficed; and he does not remember any priest ever going on a sick call. First Communions are now a matter of ancient history; nor are there any baptisms or confirmations except in cities. Only a few students are found in the seminaries, and on one occasion a priest celebrated Mass in cassock and surplice, without candles, bells or server. Since the separation of Church and State conditions are worse.

The inference from all this is, first, that these conditions are general throughout France; and secondly, that they are to be ascribed largely not to the enemies of the Church, but to the hierarchy and clergy.

No doubt there are parts of France where this deplorable state of things obtains, and the writer of the article in question apparently lived in such surroundings. But it is in order to ask whether it is fair to fasten the blame of it on the very men who were necessarily its most conspicuous victims? There may be in many parts of France no sermons, no sick calls, no First Communions, no confirmations, no religious marriages, but there is a valid reason for that; namely, there are no congregations. Twenty-five years and more of malignantly anti-Christian Public school education

## AUTOMOBILES, LIVERY, GARAGE

R. HUESTON & SONS  
Livery and Garage. Open Day and Night  
Star Livery Bon-Ton Livery  
479 to 483 Richmond St. 350 Wellington St.  
Phone 433 Phone 441

## BARRISTERS AND SOLICITORS

FRANK J. FOLEY  
BARRISTER-AT-LAW  
The Kent Building, Corner Yonge & Richmond Sts.  
TORONTO

## FINANCIAL

THE ONTARIO LOAN & DEBENTURE COY  
Capital paid up, \$1,750,000. Reserve \$1,450,000  
Deposits received Debentures issued, Real Estate Loans made, John McCarty, Pres., A. M. Stuart, Mgr.  
Offices: Dundas St., Cor. Market Lane, London.

have not only obliterated every vestige of Christianity from the hearts and minds of many of the present generation in France, but have inculcated a bitter scorn of the ministrations or even the presence of a priest. Is it fair to frame an indictment against a clergy for not preaching and administering the sacraments to people taught by almost every successive Government for more than a century to hate and loathe everything connected with Christianity? Let a Catholic priest here attempt to preach to a set of Socialists and anarchists and he will find himself in a parallel situation.

Furthermore, is it fair, or even honest, to convey the impression, either directly or inferentially, that such is the average state of the entire country? France at the present time has thousands of her sons and daughters sacrificing their lives in the foreign missions of every part of the world. Did these devoted children of God come from families that had no religion? To-day, in spite of the ruthless spoliation of which she has been the victim, she still keeps her proud place at the head of all the countries of the world contributing to the Propagation of the Faith. Does that indicate a total loss of her old religious spirit? When the test of her fidelity was called for she willingly, almost eagerly, gave up her cathedrals and churches and schools and hospitals and devoted 60,000 or 70,000 of her religious to beggary and exile rather than compromise with the enemies of the Holy See. Was that magnificent display of loyalty, which baffled the enemies of the Faith, astounded the world and made the heart of the Universal Church leap with joy, the result of twenty-five years of neglected duty? To-day a fire of enthusiasm is running from one end of France to the other in splendid and successful efforts to recover that ancient glory which more than a century of anti-Christian governments has wrung from her. Why, then, turn our eyes from the struggle of the Holy See. Was that magnificent display of loyalty, which baffled the enemies of the Faith, astounded the world and made the heart of the Universal Church leap with joy, the result of twenty-five years of neglected duty? To-day a fire of enthusiasm is running from one end of France to the other in splendid and successful efforts to recover that ancient glory which more than a century of anti-Christian governments has wrung from her. Why, then, turn our eyes from the struggle of the Holy See. Was that magnificent display of loyalty, which baffled the enemies of the Faith, astounded the world and made the heart of the Universal Church leap with joy, the result of twenty-five years of neglected duty? To-day a fire of enthusiasm is running from one end of France to the other in splendid and successful efforts to recover that ancient glory which more than a century of anti-Christian governments has wrung from her. Why, then, turn our eyes from the struggle of the Holy See.

Keep your mind, heart and will subject, for the love of Him who submitted, unreservedly, to all those whom His eternal Father permitted to command Him.

## THIS MONEY-MAKING BOOK IS FREE

Tells of an Investment Safer and More Profitable Than Bank or Railroad Stock.

Endorsed by Leading Bankers Government Officials and the Catholic Hierarchy and Laity.

A valuable book of interest to and for circulation only among Catholics has just been issued, and will be sent free and postpaid to any reader of the CATHOLIC RECORD who has \$20 or more to invest.

The book tells of a line of business that has and is paying enormous dividends, and which is being supported by Catholics to the extent of \$75,000,000 a year. It contains most complete facts and figures relating to this particular business and the astonishing dividends paid stockholders. It shows how Catholics may, for the first time, now become stockholders and receive their share of the profits of this great business. The stock of old established companies in this line is worth ten to twenty times par value, and original investors are receiving 100 per cent. dividends.

This is not a get-rich-quick scheme but a high-class, legitimate business enterprise, backed by leading banks and the Catholic hierarchy and laity.

This is the opportunity of a lifetime to make a safe and profitable investment, and worth the attention and investigation of every conservative investor.

If you would like to have a copy of this book, address Philip Harding, Dept. 615H, Box 1301, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mr. Harding requests that no one write simply through idle curiosity and unless you are a member of the Catholic Church the book will be of no interest to you, because only Catholics will be permitted to hold stock in this particular institution.