

marriage is no mere civil contract, but a vow in the sight of God binding the parties by obligations of conscience above and beyond those of the civil law." To assert that Parliament is independent of religious authority in matrimonial and divorce legislation is a reversion to paganism. The civil effects of marriage are exclusively under the civil authority, but the marriage bond it cannot touch. "What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." Those legislators who deny that revealed religion, or its author, Christ Himself, has authority to prevent them legalizing divorce, will, however, at least admit that they are bound by the laws of ethics, and that consequently they may not pass any law that is naturally unjust or immoral. To attempt to win over those persons to the anti-divorce forces, we will show that, independently of any supernatural religion, natural ethics prove marriage to be indissoluble, except by death, and condemn divorce as immoral.

NEED AND OBJECT OF MATRIMONY

Divorce is the dissolution of marriage during the lifetime of the parties. We are not now concerned with that partial divorce granted for adultery at the request of the innocent party, which consists merely in separation from bed and board. By divorce we mean the dissolution of marriage. Marriage may mean either the contractual act by which man and woman become husband and wife, or the matrimonial state which results therefrom. We are here concerned with marriage as a state. In its loosest sense, which includes the most imperfect forms of marriage found in history, marriage may be defined as "A stable union of persons of opposite sex, made under contract, with a view principally to the birth and rearing of children." Nature, that is, the God of nature, has established sex for the continuance of the race and nature wills that the race be continued. This can be done only by a stable union of the sexes for the birth and education of children, and this is precisely what constitutes matrimony. Marriage, therefore, is necessary by natural law in the interest of the child, and through him, in the interest of the race.

The primary natural end of marriage is the birth and rearing of children. Without marriage, without the society which marriage constitutes, namely the family, the child's life and welfare are not provided for, and the race would inevitably degenerate and decay. Individuals marry indeed for various reasons, for love, for position, for wealth or for any other motive, just as individuals eat and drink for pleasure or for company. Yet the chief need and cause of eating is to sustain the life of the individual, and the chief need and cause of marriage is to sustain the life of the race, by procreation and rearing of children. The first duty of marriage is then this: Anything opposed to the procreation and rearing of children is condemned by the natural law. Now divorce, that is, the dissolution of marriage, is opposed to the procreation and education of children, as we shall prove. Therefore divorce is condemned by the natural law.

INDISSOLUBLE OF MARRIAGE

Divorce is opposed to the natural law because by its very nature it dissolves marriage, and breaks up the most sacred and most necessary natural unit, the family. The following argument proves this by showing that nature intended marriage to be indissoluble, except by death.

The production and rearing of offspring is common alike to man and to animals. In the case of both it necessitates an association of the male and female till the rearing of the offspring is fully accomplished. This argument is thus stated by the greatest of Christian philosophers, St. Thomas Aquinas, in his Summa contra Gentiles, chapter cxxii.

ST. THOMAS' ARGUMENT

"With all animals in which the female by herself does not suffice for the rearing of the offspring, male and female dwell together as long as is necessary for the rearing and training of the offspring. Now in the human species, the female is clearly insufficient of herself for the rearing of the offspring, since the needs of human life make many demands which cannot be met by one parent alone. Nor is this reasoning traversed by the fact of some particular woman having wealth and power enough to nourish her offspring all by herself: for in human acts the line of natural rectitude is not drawn to suit the accidental variety of the individuals, but the properties common to the whole species. A further consideration is that in the human species the young need not only bodily nutrition, but also the training of the soul. Other animals have their natural instincts to provide for themselves; but man lives by reason, which takes the experience of a long time to arrive at discretion. Hence children need instruction by the combined experience of their parents; nor are they capable of such instruction as soon as they are born, but only after a long time, when they reach the age of discretion. For this instruction again a long time is needed; and then, moreover, because of the assaults of passion, whereby the judgment of experience is thwarted, there is need, not of instruction only, but also of repression. For this purpose the woman by herself is not competent, but at this point especially there is requisite the concurrence of the

man, in whom there is at once reason more perfect to instruct, and force more potent to chastise. Therefore in the human race the training of the young must last, not for a short time, as in birds, but for a long period of life. Hence whereas it is necessary in all animals for the male to stand by the female for such time as the father's concurrence is requisite for the bringing up of the progeny, it is natural to man, that the father and the mother should be for long years united in one domestic society. This we call marriage."

THE FATHER'S DUTY

"If a period of union between male and female is prescribed in the case of animals whenever their young requires their common care, much more is such a union prescribed in the case of human parents, the capacity of the child being so much greater than those of the animal, whilst his power to attain the objects of those capacities without the help of its parents is so much less. Nature, therefore, requires a stable or abiding union of the sexes, and not a mere momentary or short lived union, or a union lasting only as long as fancy and affection direct. Any such short-lived union would constitute a betrayal of, and a gross violation of, nature's requirements in regard to the child. The co-operation of the father with the mother is, therefore, necessary during the child's first years. The duty of caring for the child devolves as much on the father as on the mother. The father is, equally with the mother, the cause of the child's existence, and, therefore, equally with the mother he is charged by nature with the child's welfare. Since it was as one joint principle that they gave the child existence, as one joint principle they are bound to care for the child. Therefore their duty of caring for the child's welfare, is to be fulfilled, not in lives apart and independent, but in a single joint family life lasting as long as the right of the child to call to them for aid and guidance endures. Moreover, without the support of the father, both mother and child will under ordinary conditions find it difficult to survive. No accident of fortune, or of condition can rid a man of his responsibility to his child and its mother."

INDISSOLUBLE BEFORE SEVENTY

"If the only end contemplated by nature in the institution of marriage, were the birth and rearing, by each man and woman, of one child, then a father and mother would have fully discharged the duties imposed upon them by the primary natural precept of remaining together for a space of about twenty years after the birth of the child, at which age the natural period of tutelage is supposed to end. This would be the shortest period of time contemplated by nature in relation to marriage, and any sundering of the marriage tie before the end of that period would be impossible in natural law. But the birth of only one child does not represent the normal condition of the family, and it is by the normal conditions that the natural laws and properties of marriage are determined." Now, normally, it is to be expected that during the first twenty years of married life other children will be born, and that these nurture cycles will be renewed at intervals as long as fertility lasts, on which account the marriage union must be continued till twenty years after the birth of the youngest child, or speaking more generally, till twenty years after fecundity has ceased. Hence, normally, the primary requirements of nature will not have been met before the parents reach the very advanced age of about seventy years.

And since, as we said, the laws of nature are determined, not by what is exceptional, but by what is normal and ordinary, this is the least period contemplated by nature in regard to the marriage union. Marriage, therefore, concludes Dr. Cronin, from whom we have been citing and summarizing so profusely, "is a union enduring by strict natural law up to the age of about seventy years."

The necessary conclusion which flows from this first principle is this: "Divorce, before the parents attain the age of seventy, is prohibited by the primary end of marriage,—the good of the child,—and is consequently impossible in natural law."

INDISSOLUBLE AFTER SEVENTY

A consideration of the secondary end of marriage, the happiness and good of the parents, excludes divorce during the few declining years of life. First: A wife has a right in commutative justice to the support and fidelity of her husband to the end. To him she has given her whole life, as far as it could have any value for him. In return she must get love and protection for her whole life. "If he could send her away when she was advanced in years, he would do the woman harm contrary to natural equity." (Contra Gentiles Cxxiii.)

Secondly: Love unlike more sensate attraction is lasting. As Aquinas put it: "The greater the love, the more need for it to be firm and lasting. But the love of man and woman is counted strongest of all, seeing that they are united for the sharing in common of all domestic life, as a sign whereof a man leaves even father and mother for the sake

of his wife. Therefore marriage should be indissoluble." (Contra Gentiles Cxxiii). To which may be added Aristotle's argument, given in his Ethics, that it is an inseparable characteristic of human love to claim the person loved wholly for oneself, to honor the person loved, and to desire a return of love equal to one's own. These principles exclude all once polygamy and divorce. "I love you," means "I love you until death do us part." Or, again to quote Aristotle, "Man and woman do not form a marriage for the sake of life, but for the sake of a perfect life."

IT IS THE CHILD WHO PAYS

There are not wanting other and minor arguments precluding the possibility of divorce during the declining years of life, such as the right of a child, at any age, to return to his parent for necessary assistance, and the right of the child to inherit the family property, both of which are difficult under the divorce system, but the arguments given are ample. After all, where divorce is permitted, it is obtained not after the parents have lived together for better or for worse for half a century, but during the early years of married life. It will be sought as soon as possible in order to permit the dissatisfied parties to find other partners in life, if they so desire. Thus the children, if there should be children, will be left without the guidance of their father and mother during their tenderest years. Damage is sometimes claimed in the divorce court, but it is the child who pays.

OTHER EVILS OF DIVORCE

Let me reinforce these proofs of the immorality of divorce, with the following argument of the prince of medieval and Christian philosophers; St. Thomas Aquinas:

"There is in the human species a natural exigency for the union of husband and wife to be one and indivisible. For the union of husband and wife must be regulated by law, not merely from the point of view of procreation, but also with one eye to good manners, or manners conformable to right reason, as well for man as an individual, as also for man as a member of a household of family, or again as a member of civil society. Thus understood, good manners involve the indissolubility of the union of husband and wife. For they will love each other with greater fidelity, when they know that they are inseparably united; each partner will take greater care of the things of the house, reflecting that they are to remain permanently in possession of the same things; occasions of quarrels are removed that might otherwise arise between the husband and his wife's relations, if the husband were to divorce his wife, and thus affinity becomes a firmer bond of amity; also occasions of adultery are cut off, occasions which readily offer themselves if husband would divorce his wife, or wife her husband." (Contra Gentiles Cxxiii.)

St. Thomas lived in a civilization which knew no divorce, yet in his outline of Christian philosophy, written for non-Catholics, he did not fail to point out its intrinsic immorality in natural law. We, who are living in an age when divorce is inscribed in the law books of nearly every country, should find it much easier to realize its inherent evils, and disastrous consequences. When Parliament or court dissolves a contract, the rights even of third parties are usually sedulously guarded; but when the marriage contract is dissolved, the right of the first party, of him for whom marriage and sex exist, the child—is utterly ignored. He is deprived of his parents. There may exist abnormal circumstances in individual cases where the child may seem to lose nothing by losing his parents, but nature frames her rules of life, and her canons of good and evil, on the usual and normal needs of humanity. It has been well said: "In comparison with the tragedy of the betrayal of the child at divorce, every other tragedy of the home shrinks into insignificance."

Not merely the child suffers, but the race suffers, and it is primarily for the race through the child, that marriage exists. The possibility of divorce leads to legalized race suicide. Those married couples who take into their consideration the possibility of their future divorce are less likely to fetter their liberty by the burden of children. The normal ability of divorce not merely leads at times to the unnatural offences connected with race suicide, it also encourages the commission of those other crimes on account of which divorce is given. Divorce laws, despite the clauses against cohabitation and collusion, are to some people an incentive to desertion or adultery; and in all cases, the remarriage which divorce permits is merely legalized adultery. These are strong statements, and plain statements; yet statements just as strong and just as plain are found in the Gospels. For from the whole series of arguments indicated this morning, it is abundantly clear that divorce, that is, the dissolution of marriage, despite the annoying abnormal conditions which exist in some marriages, is impossible in natural law, even for adultery. Hence the law of nature is seen to be the same as the law of Christ:

"Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her; and if she herself shall put away her husband, and marry another, she committeth adultery." Mark 10: 11, 12.

DIVORCE WORSE THAN POLYGAMY

Moreover, once you allow 'divorce for adultery' as in Canada, there will be a demand for divorce for

insanity, for cruelty, for habitual drunkenness, and for desertion. Of the more than one million divorces which were granted in twenty-one years in the United States, three hundred and ninety thousand were granted for desertion! Divorce for desertion leads to divorce for incompatibility of temper, and even to divorce by consent. Laws permitting divorce by consent, the old Pagan Roman idea, have in the last centuries, actually been placed on the statute books of nominally Christian countries. Yet even the nation which permits divorce only on account of the crime of adultery is, in this respect, lower than those savages which repudiate divorce but allow polygamy. For polygamy, or the simultaneous possession of several wives, despite the fact that it puts the wife in an inferior position without pride or self respect, atrophies all the finer human affections and seriously handicaps the future of the child, is nevertheless, not in itself as great an evil as divorce. For divorce opposes the primary end of marriage, the procreation and education of children, and puts asunder the most sacred human unit—the family.

DIVORCE AND POLYGAMY

It is no argument to say that the Jews in the fourteenth century before Christ practised divorce. The rudeness and crudeness of their civilization, far superior though it was to that of our pagan European ancestors who were then living in the Bronze Age, permitted both divorce and polygamy. But those evils, for evils they are, were merely tolerated by God to avoid a greater evil, as St. Paul teaches: "The times of ignorance therefore God overlooked" (Acts 17: 30). It was a case of "the passing over in the sins done aforetime in (the time of) the forbearance of God." (1—Romans 3: 25, according to the Greek), that is "an overlooking of, what in a more perfect state of society would be, 'sins.'" "Sin is not imputed where there is no law" (Romans 5: 13) either revealed, or "written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness therewith" (Romans 2: 15). There was no perfect law, either revealed or natural, known then to the Jews, because a very rude society could not bear such perfection. Divorce is indeed condemned by the natural law, according to which marriage is intrinsically indissoluble, but this truth was not perceived by the Jews, who however, for centuries practised divorce but little, as they punished adultery with death. Will anyone seriously maintain that we are living under the marriage legislation of the Pentateuch and may stone to death the man or the woman guilty of adultery or practise polygamy as did the pious King David? Yet the polygamy of David is less repulsive, and less opposed to the natural law than the divorce of Deuteronomy.

THE FRIENDS AND THE OPPONENTS OF DIVORCE

The friends of divorce are either the sentimental, the sensual, the Lutheran, the bigoted, the doctrinaire or the legalist. The sentimental consider some abnormal case where an innocent wife is ruined by a brute of a husband, and without considering the hundredfold greater evils which result from the society they propose, clamor for divorce, and even for easy divorce. The sensual wish divorce because the indissolubility of marriage is a check on the passions. Their ideal is purely pagan and depraved. The Lutherans are those who erroneously consider with Luther that Christ permitted divorce for adultery. Several Protestant sects in Canada hold this Lutheran view. The schismatic Greeks held it before him. The blindly bigoted (and/or) people's support of divorce because the Catholic Church opposes it. The doctrinaire see in the Family and in the Church the two institutions which oppose their dream of an omnipotent servile state. Hence they fight both by urging divorce, which at once dissolves the family and decays morals and religion. To this class, without however seeing the logical pagan outcome of their principles, belong the legalists, that is those who think that the society of all law, other than that of voluntary associations, is the State. The supporters of divorce are active the whole world over. Every country has its divorce question, though, thank God, not all countries have divorce. The Catholic Church, both for revealed and rational reasons, is everywhere the consistent enemy of divorce. She would lose a kingdom rather than divorce a king. A high or low law then forbids her, under any circumstances, ever to dissolve the valid and consummated marriage of two Christians. Outside the Catholic Church the opponents of divorce, while they number multitudes of earnest Christians, lack organization, unity, and sometimes courage. The results is that a minority imposes divorce and thus wounds the womb of the race. The Catholic minority appeals to the Protestant majority to abolish divorce in Canada.

Divorce even for one cause, is no essential part of the Protestant tradition. In England, owing to the opposition of the Anglican Church to divorce, there were less than six divorces in the whole of the seventeenth century. Today in Canada, a minister of the Church of England in Canada is forbidden by legislation of the General Synod to marry a divorced person. An increasing number of Protestant commentators, of both the conservative and liberal wings, hold that Christ abolished

all divorce. A union of the Christian forces in Canada that are opposed to divorce is as possible as it is needful.

SENATE BILLS I AND J

The recent divorce debate in the Canadian Senate makes sad reading. Without any request or mandate from the people of Ontario, two private Bills I and J were passed which establish, if they become law, divorce and divorce courts, in the province of Ontario, and a similar divorce court in Prince Edward Island. Just two days before the Senate passed its first Bill, the British House of Commons passed a resolution affirming, "Any change in the law that would impair the permanence of the marriage contract would be harmful to the best interests of the community."

The Senate Bills are a change in the law which would impair the permanence of the marriage contract. At present there is no divorce law, and there never has been one, in Ontario or Quebec. The closest of this former Province of Canada, which desires a divorce for adultery, must seek to have a special law passed for himself alone. The Senate now proposed to establish a divorce court in Ontario, which will make divorce for adultery a right and not, as it now is, a privilege. That this will increase the number of divorces is affirmed in the unanimous resolution of protest of the Legislature of Prince Edward Island, and proved by the statistics adduced in the Senate debate. During the period 1906-1918, before the Prairie Provinces obtained, through a legal technicality, divorce courts, the number of divorces granted in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and British Columbia, where alone divorce courts were then functioning, was proportionately to the population, over seven times greater than in the rest of Canada, where divorces were obtained only by special Acts of Parliament. It has been the same since Confederation. Establish a divorce court in Ontario, and you may expect seven times more divorces.

UNITE TO ABOLISH DIVORCES

On this question of divorce we Canadians are like a man half way down a steep precipice. Unless we pull ourselves up very soon, we shall inevitably fall down further. The only remedy for the divorce evil is total prohibition—of divorce. There are many who think that this is too high an ideal. The answer is an obvious one. Not merely the commandment against adultery (and remarriage after divorce is adultery) but the other nine commandments impose high ideals. Yet they are ideals which are and must be the law of our being.

The law against divorce was promulgated by Christ, not as a new law, but as a primeval law given in the infancy of the race. The command "What therefore God hath joined together let not man put asunder," is at once a law given by the Divine Founder of Christianity, and a law given by the Divine Creator of nature. It is a natural law observed by some of the most barbarous tribes in the history of mankind. Are we Canadians to have our moral sense so blunted, our moral vision so blurred, our moral decision so weakened, that we must have divorce, when the savages of the American Islands, the aborigines of Ceylon, the Pagans of New Guinea, and other races just as barbarous, never tolerated it? In the name of God, let us unite to abolish divorce.

"THE SUPREME BLOT"

CONTINUED FROM PAGE ONE

have had a dual effect upon the American people. They have resented the former and felt that the latter brought humiliation upon America. Whilst nobody alleges in America that the President is not "straight," and whilst he still has a following, he is the best hated man in the country. At a public dinner in New York I have seen a New York lawyer change color as he spoke about him; listened to an insurance president, who had been to Princeton with him, first become blasphemous, then speechless, in referring to him and found generally, especially amongst those big business men who rule America, an extraordinary bitter and personal hatred of the President, often unjustified.

Nothing was ever farther from the truth than the assumption by England that Mr. Wilson represented America. Before the Versailles conference he represented a portion of America—after it, he represented little but himself. England has all along been backing the wrong horse. Here let us define the position of the President to the Senate. The Senate, under the American Constitution, is an independent body with independent powers where treaties are concerned. Mr. Wilson's commitments, committed it to nothing. Under the Constitution a conflict between Executive and Legislature is always possible, which means, as Americans were careful to point out, that if the Covenant of the League stood unaltered, some future President could commit the U. S. A., through its League representative, to some policy disapproved by the Legislature.

But behind all and dominating all in America's refusal to sign the original Covenant is the Monroe Doctrine, which, summed up, means only: "The Americas for the Americans!" But if all else were agreed between England and America, Ireland alone

would still be the ghost at the feast of international understanding. Ireland has been seventy-five years in American politics, in which the Irish genius for politics has led to a dominating place for Irishmen. Wherever I went in America, men of every type and position in life, both Republican and Democrat, said to me: "What about Ireland?" At an address by Lord Reading to some two thousand of America's leading business and professional men, I heard man after man as we went out say: "But he said nothing about Ireland? Why?"

I have seen an Irish parade in New York in which, literally, thousands of American soldiers in khaki marched past hour by hour—all bearing the Irish Republican colors down Fifth Avenue. Every Irish-American who died on the West Front is regarded as not only dying for America and democracy—but for Ireland. America to day is not Nationalist—she is Sinn Féin.

Ireland to the American mind is the supreme blot upon the British championship of the small nations, and in the American eye lies like a shadow upon all that England has done in the War. It is impossible in the limits of this article to describe the ceaseless Irish propaganda against England. It goes on, literally, day and night, carried by tongues of flame and printed word. The cities and villages of the East, as of that hub of America, the Middle West, right across the continent to San Francisco, are being won with millions of articles and pamphlets. De Valera has received a national tribute denied to king, and the American Senate voted by sixty to one that the Sinn Féin leaders should be heard at the Peace Conference. I myself have met one of Chicago's first criminal lawyers, not an Irishman, who had been in Ireland collecting evidence against British rule, which he was preparing for his 13,000 syndicated newspapers and periodicals—and his was only one voice of thousands. Until Ireland is settled, nothing is settled.

To accept the psychological differences as fact and to make allowance for them; to change radically the economic policy of the Old Men of the Sea upon the lines indicated; to settle with Ireland at whatever cost . . . there lies the policy leading to a genuine and lasting Anglo-American understanding, making for righteousness throughout the world. It is the duty of the English Government or statesman with the vision to see it or the courage to initiate it? America is waiting.—McLean's Magazine.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH EXTENSION SOCIETY OF CANADA

THE MASS

Sacrifice began with religion. In practically all races do we find the offering either actually practised or preached. The heart of man in recognizing God wishes to adore Him and offer sacrifice. There is no question about the numerous sacrifices of the Jews and the elaborate ritual observances with which their offerings were surrounded. Now were pagan custom very different.

Christ having come "to give His life for the redemption of many" offered the most perfect of all sacrifices and gave a value to all that had been done with God's sanction under the Jewish law. But He wished that sacrifice to be perpetuated. God even foretold that it would be perpetual and universal. "Who is there among you, that will shut the doors, and will kindle the fire on my altar gratis? I have no pleasure in you saith the Lord of Hosts; and I will not receive a gift from your hands. For from the rising of the sun even to the going down, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered in My name a clean oblation: for My name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Hosts."

St. Paul constantly draws comparisons between the old dispensation and Christ's offering. The former is but a type of figure of the great events to come. The Apostles went everywhere preaching Christ and Him crucified, doubtless to show that the redemption of man was accomplished. These two ideas are explained also by St. Peter, "You were not redeemed with corruptible things as gold and silver . . . but with the precious Blood of Christ, as a lamb unspotted and undefiled." And very clearly the contrast placed before the Jews by St. Paul: "For if the blood of goats and oxen and the ashes of a heifer being sprinkled, sanctify such as are defiled, to the cleansing of the flesh; how much more shall the Blood of Christ, who by the Holy Ghost offered Himself unspotted unto God, cleanse our conscience from dead works."

It was the same Apostle also who explained the nature and value of the words and actions of Our Divine Saviour at the Last Supper "For as often as you shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord, until He come." He thus interpreted for us the meaning of the command "This do for the commemoration of Me."

It is altogether impossible to recall these truths without becoming thoroughly convinced that we must in every way cooperate with the desire of the Church to have the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass offered everywhere. Wherever the light of

God's sun shines there shall be an altar, repeating among men in its mystic form the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. All men must learn that Christ died for them; to them must be preached as the Apostles of old preached that Christ died for them and redeemed them; before them must be renewed "in every place" that "clean oblation" of Our Divine Saviour's eternal sacrifice.

These thoughts based upon the consideration of Our Saviour's work give a sanction to our missionary labors which compels everyone to consider their great importance. Our attempt to place missions in the field has as its incentive the wish to have proclaimed to every creature the redemption of Christ, the wish to have the benefits applied to souls, the wish to see the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass offered as a clean oblation to God, to adore Him, to thank Him for His favors, to obtain the remission of sin and to petition Him for our daily wants.

Missionary work is God's work and when the Extension Society endeavors to plant missions, chapels, and send missionaries we then know that Society is engaged in work dearest to the heart of Our Divine Lord and one worthy in every way of our strongest support. Let every Catholic then consider if a part of his duty to extend God's Kingdom on earth by supporting the missions. Donations may be addressed to: Rev. T. O'Donnell, President, Catholic Church Extension Society, 67 Bond St., Toronto.

Contributions through this office should be addressed to: EXTENSION, CATHOLIC RECORD OFFICE, London, Ont.

DONATIONS

Previously acknowledged \$8,479 58

MASS INTENTIONS
A Reader, Ashfield..... 5 00
E. G. P., Ottawa..... 4 00

FATHER FRASER'S CHINA MISSION FUND

APPEAL FOR FUNDS

There are four hundred million pagans in China. If they were to pass in review at the rate of a thousand a minute, it would take nine months for them all to go by. Thirty-three thousand of them die daily un baptized! Missionaries are urgently needed to go to their rescue.

China Mission College, Almonte, Ontario, Canada, is for the education of priests for China. It has already fourteen students, and many more are applying for admittance. Unfortunately funds are lacking to accept them all. China is crying out for missionaries. They are ready to go. Will you send them? The salvation of millions of souls depends on your answer to this urgent appeal. His Holiness the Pope blesses benefactors, and the students pray for them daily.

A Bursar of \$5,000 will support a student in perpetuity. Help to complete the Burses. Gratefully yours in Jesus and Mary J. M. FRASER.

SACRED HEART BURSAR
Previously acknowledged \$4,597 75
Thos. Prandergast, St. Philips, Nfld..... 2 00
In honor of St. Anthony..... 1 00
F. P. Ashad..... 6 00
In honor of Sacred Heart, Picton, Ont..... 2 00
Sacred Heart Promoters, Indian River Parish, P.E.I. 10 00

QUEEN OF APOSTLES BURSAR
Previously acknowledged \$1,679 72

ST. ANTHONY'S BURSAR
Previously acknowledged..... \$908 20
Mrs. A. G. Lewis, Vancouver 5 00
Mrs. Jas. Chadder, Goulds Bay Mills, Road, Nfld..... 60
Mrs. Johannah Walsh..... 50
Mrs. John Ryan..... 50
Mrs. John Ryan..... 50
Miss Agnes Walsh..... 50
Miss Margaret Walsh..... 25
Miss Nellie Walsh..... 1 0

IMMACULATE CONCEPTION BURSAR
Previously acknowledged..... \$1,874 70

COMPONER OF THE AFFLICTED BURSAR
Previously acknowledged..... \$307 53

ST. JOSEPH, PATRON OF CHINA, BURSAR
Previously acknowledged..... \$1,449 87

BLESSED SACRAMENT BURSAR
Previously acknowledged..... \$285 25

STELLA MARIS SUNDAY SCHOOL, Picton, N. S..... 6 00

ST. FRANCIS XAVIER BURSAR
Previously acknowledged..... \$243 80

HOLY NAME OF JESUS BURSAR
Previously acknowledged..... \$204 09

HOLY SOULS BURSAR
Previously acknowledged..... \$581 75

The Misses Julia and Alice O'Neil, St. Andrews, N. B. 15 00

LITTLE FLOWER BURSAR
Previously acknowledged..... \$381 87

SACRED HEART LEAGUE BURSAR
Previously acknowledged..... \$527 60

Mrs. George B. Adams, Bath, Ont..... 60 00

Mrs. Archibald S. McLellan, Indian River, P. E. I..... 2 00

Mr. Walter J. McLellan, Indian River, P. E. I..... 8 00

Mr. John A. McLellan and family, Indian River, P.E.I. 10 00

A Friend, Galt..... 1 00

There be harmonies of earth so sacred and so sweet, that they live on in Heaven.—John Ayscough.