

CARDINAL RICHARD'S LETTER.

To the President of the French Republic:

Sir,—A profound and painful impression has been created throughout all France by the decree which has closed one hundred and twenty-five schools, and by the ministerial circular which has shut up two thousand five hundred additional schools.

It is our duty to communicate to the official head of the State the solicitude we feel on this occasion, on religious as well as patriotic grounds.

The first question which suggests itself is: What are the motives which have called for this sudden and violent measure? There has been no scandal, no disorder in these educational establishments, which are under the direction of teachers holding certificates as the law requires. The only reason there can be advanced is that the instruction given in these schools is in keeping with the principles of the Catholic Faith, and that the teachers belong to religious congregations. An additional reason is that the Freemasons only declare that every Christian idea shall be eliminated from the education of the young.

This is a violent attack upon conscience directed against families. As a Bishop, it is our duty and our right to protest in the name of these families against this sort of tyranny which is the most cruel of all tyrannies. It is to be noted that these attacks have been systematically planned by the anti-Christian sects. In 1886 a law dealing with school instruction, religious instruction from the school curriculum. Four years later teachers who were members of religious congregations were excluded from the public schools on the grounds that the teachers, being Catholics, taught things the State could not permit teachers in its pay to teach.

Families, by way of reply to these laws, established schools at the cost of many sacrifices frequently renewed. Great crowds of children flocked into these schools. As a counter stroke to this, continuous manifestations of the wishes of families, the Freemasons enacted the law of association, which aims at making the establishment of free schools impossible. The simultaneous closing of about three thousand schools has no other object in view than the doing away with religious instruction in the free schools after it had been excluded from the public schools.

After the statement of these self-evident facts, we deem it useless to stop to discuss in detail the measures adopted for the closing of the schools. After the declaration made by Premier Waldeck-Rousseau, a great number of the directors of these schools felt they were safe. Their sincerity could not be called in question. The ministerial circular closing two thousand five hundred schools had not made its appearance, and, besides, a ministerial circular cannot order the closing of educational establishments. If the authorities desired to afford, we shall not say in a spirit of kindness, but in a spirit of severity, to the teachers who had not done so an opportunity of complying with legal formalities, they could have manifested this desire by granting reasonable delays. The granting of such delays was rendered more necessary by the fact that persons versed in knowledge of the laws and of administrative regulations question the necessity and the legality of the formalities required of the teachers. The measures adopted manifest an evident desire to close the schools after every means had been employed to bring this about.

These measures are the more regrettable because France needs an era of good feeling. You yourself, Mr. President, have given expression to this view on more than one occasion. We all share it. Now, there can be no good feeling unless due regard be had for religious and civil liberty. The history of the past teaches this lesson. At the dawn of the century just closed France demanded a cessation of the tyranny which the anti-Christian sects had imposed upon her. Very instructive is the spectacle of the legislative assemblies studying in 1802 the essential conditions on which social order depends.

The first cry, so to speak, that went up from all parts of France was that religion was absolutely necessary. M. Portalis, a man of eminence, who was intrusted with the task of presenting to the legislative body the grave questions involved in the restoration of social order to the country, declared: "The laws and morality will not suffice. The law can only stay the uplifted arm; religion rules the heart."

The conscience of the action manifested itself in the unmistakable manner, especially in respect to the vital question of education. M. Portalis asserts that the voice of all good citizens was heard in the departmental assemblies, proclaiming: "The time has come when theories must give way to facts. There can be no instruction without education; there can be no education without morality and religion." Then, recalling the marvelous works accomplished by the Catholic Church among us, Mr. Portalis adds: "Catholic piety has founded and sustained our charitable institutions. What have we done? After the general devastation, when we desired to re-establish our hospitals, we recalled those Christian virgins known as Sisters of Charity, who generously devoted their lives to the service of distressed, suffering and infirm humanity."

M. Portalis, summing up the situation, concludes that "France cannot deliberately abjure Christianity * * without effacing the monuments of her own glory. He then adds: "There is no religion better adapted to the prevailing conditions in all well-governed countries, nor more suited to the political life of all governments. It is not the religion of a people, but of a man; it is not a national, but a world-wide religion."

Plus VII. came to us, and, though the Concordat sealed the religious peace, France resumed her centuries-old traditions, which had been

swept away by the tempest of the Revolution. Today Leo XIII. comes to us in the same spirit of love for our fatherland. "We have omitted no effort," says Leo XIII., "to accomplish for France the work of pacification which will secure for her incalculable advantages, not only in the religious, but likewise in the civil and political order." The French bishops share Leo XIII.'s desire to bring about harmony. Thus do we respond, Mr. President, to the wish you recently expressed in reference to the subsidence of animosities and the union of our dearly beloved France. Respect for religious and civil liberty will bind mind to mind, and heart to heart. If France is attached to existing political institutions, and we unhesitatingly recognize that she is, she does not desire religious persecution.

The Freemasons are unceasingly at work trying to create division by attacking Christian institutions. As for us, Mr. President, we will continue, with God's aid, to fulfill the duty of a bishop—of a French bishop. We will defend religious liberty; we will defend the liberty of the family in matters touching the education of children; we will defend all legitimate liberties to which, as citizens, we are entitled. We ask no privileges, but we demand that Catholics shall not be deprived of rights which they share in common with all French citizens. We are convinced that in acting in this way, we shall be working for the general pacification.

In closing this letter, we express, as our vernal predecessor, Cardinal Guibert, before us expressed, the hope that France will never permit herself to be despoiled of the sacred beliefs which were the source of her strength and of her glory in the past, and which placed her in the first rank among nations. I commend, Mr. President, these grave considerations to your wisdom, and beg of you to accept the expression of my most respectful consideration.

FRANCIS CARDINAL RICHARD,
Archbishop of Paris,
Paris, July 19, 1902.

CATHOLICS AND "CURES."

Official Attitude of the Church Towards Alleged Miraculous Recoveries and Sacred Relics.

From the Providence Visitor.

Many Catholics, we are told, have expressed their surprise that Bishop Farley should have declined to offer an opinion to a newspaper man on the real significance of the "cures" which are reported to have been worked lately by an alleged relic of St. Ann, preserved in the French Church of St. John Baptist in New York city. That any wonderment should be aroused at all in the matter shows one how general is the haziness that prevails even among well-instructed Catholics on the Church's official attitude towards "cures" and the relics that are popularly believed to bring them about. Bishop Farley, let us say, once for all, could not in reasonableness have published an "opinion" in that offhand fashion, even if he had made up his mind as to the true character of the portents described. Ecclesiastical personages know what value attaches to their words in times of passing excitement; and they are bound by a kind of informal etiquette not to add fuel to the fire. Long experience has brought them a tradition of reserve; and the prelate who should transgress it would probably find himself a subject of discussion at Rome.

The Church has never lent herself to the Protestant and semi-naturalistic view that the age of miracles is passed. She seems to hold that the rewards promised in Scripture to "great faith" may be won at all times, if men will only seek them in the right temper. As betraying her instincts in this, she has instituted severe legal processes—processes more severe legal processes—processes more fastidiously searching in their treatment of evidence than, let us say, our own august Senate Document 190 has ever been submitted to. The Bishop of the diocese in which the "signs" are alleged to have shown themselves is the obvious judge of their genuineness and authenticity. Canonical procedure recognizes that fact and gives all "ordinaries" the right to convene a court of inquiry, if an investigation is deemed useful or necessary. Usually Bishops are slow to act in such junctures; not because their faith in the supernatural is weak, but because their knowledge of human nature is usually of the kind that begets a habit of incredulity towards people with a story to tell. They are hard men to convince; and most of us are ready to thank God for their mental inertia. It is best for all concerned that they should move slowly. It is a note of wisdom to be in no hurry to draw conclusions. A newspaper reporter on a New York daily, if one will only reflect upon it, seems a ridiculously inappropriate person to inaugurate an official inquiry. His business is to feed the appetite for sensation; a Bishop's business is to build up and strengthen among his people the faith of which he is the hereditary guardian.

Then as to the relics themselves, which are reputed to work these extraordinary phenomena. It is here, if anywhere, that the true ethos, or hereditary disposition, of the Christian Church, as the jealous custodian of the original deposit of faith comes into clear outline. Though she suffers her ministers in a hundred ways to cultivate the habit of *pia credulitas*, or the dutiful instinct of alertness towards the ever-present supernatural in her children, she herself has never yet set the seal of her authentic approval on any relic whatever. As Father Sylvester Hunter, S. J., puts it, "She has never made a declaration * * * and we therefore never can have certainty on the point." She allows it to stand or fall entirely on particular testimony of which she takes no official cognizance. Witness her attitude towards the so-called "Sacred Winding Sheet of Turin," of which we have spoken before in these columns: watch her in the presence of those orthodox controversialists who impugn "the genuineness of any of the accepted instruments of the

Passion, the True Cross, the Holy Coat of Treves and the like. In all these cases she leaves us free to follow our own individual beliefs. It is a matter of private judgment, in one sense, and has nothing at all to do with that larger supernatural assent by which we accept her as the inerrant witness to the world of our own time of the whole cycle of Christ's teaching. Of course, if we are made of the right spiritual stuff we shall not be too anxious to follow the lead of these problems. We shall keep something more than the scholar's open mind. We shall have "the wish to believe," even while we resolve to be most wary.

CARDINAL PAROCCHI ON DIVORCE

American Messenger Sacred Heart.

The circular letter of Cardinal Parocchi, vice-chancellor of the Church, and secretary of the Congregation of the Inquisition, has contradicted not a little to the national sentiment against divorce in Italy. The letter, issued in the name of the eminent Cardinals Inquisitors, is addressed to all the Archbishops and Bishops of Italy, and has for purpose to draw more fully to the late allocation of Pope Leo the attention of all pastors of souls, and to arouse their zeal "so that there may not be a single diocese in Italy in which the teaching and paternal warning of the Head of the Church would not find a due response."

Before everything else, writes the Cardinal, it is important to explain to the people that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, Redeemer of the human race, having abolished the custom of divorce, brought marriage back to the principle established by the Creator, namely, that it should be one and indissoluble. To which principle the Divine Master alludes when he says: "Therefore now they are not two, but one flesh. What, therefore, God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." (St. Matt. xix, 6). The principle applied by St. Paul to the Corinthians: "A woman is bound by her husband as her husband is Christ; but if her husband die, she is at liberty; let her marry to whom she will; only in the Lord." (I Cor. vi, 39).

Furthermore, let the sanctity of marriage, raised by Jesus Christ to the dignity of a Sacrament, be fully demonstrated. Wedlock having become, in the New Law, the figure of the indissoluble union of Christ with the Church, and an efficacious sign of the grace given by the Sacrament to the spouses, Christian marriage is thereby, in its intimate nature, withdrawn from the civil power. Not only this, but a lawful and consummated marriage cannot be dissolved even by the supreme authority of the Church herself. That the secular power may legislate concerning the civil effects of the contract, no one doubts; but when it goes further and attacks the bond, it does not protect marriage but favors adultery.

This teaching, imparted to the people in a plain and practical form in the churches, especially in catechism lessons should be proclaimed in the press, as well by newspapers as by pamphlets. It is important that concerning this most weighty theme, every one, great and small, should be instructed, for, at the present day, even in the highest classes, there is great ignorance of questions affecting religion. Let the Church's constancy in condemning divorce be put in the clearest light. From the first ages, when this abuse was sanctioned by Roman laws, up to now, throughout twenty centuries, to this policy she never has been false. Recall the example of the early Fathers. Not according to the laws of the State, but to the laws of the Church, will the Lord judge thee on the last day," said St. Chrysostom, when reminded of the opposition between civil and sacred law in this matter. "The laws of Caesar are one thing; those of Christ, another," adds St. Jerome in the same regard.

The Council of Trent, condemning the very kind of errors gathered by the heretics against Christian marriage, smote with an anathema those who say, "that for heresy, or cruelty, or abandonment, the bond of matrimony may be broken;" as well as those who pretend that for adultery, at least the innocent party is free to marry again; or that such a subsequent union is not adulterous.

Our people must not be left unacquainted with the constant solicitude of the Roman Pontiffs to combat every attempt to introduce divorce, especially into the laws of the State. To quote a few examples, St. Nicholas I. with fearless firmness, compelled King Lothaire, of Lorraine, to dismiss his adulteress and take back his lawful wife, whom he had divorced. Thus Pope Urban and Paschal opposed Philip I. of France. Celestine III. and Innocent resisted Philip II. Less easy to forget is the later struggle of Clement VII. and Paul III. against the unworthy desires of these most zealous Pontiffs which they contemplated the disasters which fell upon the Isle of Saints; but to avert them, they could not betray their trust, or allow the violation of that Sacrament which is great in Christ and His Church. No one can forget the Allocution of 1808, protesting against divorce and secular interference in the question of matrimonial impediments, imposed by Napoleon on the Italian provinces annexed to his empire. Similarly, with weight of warning and argument, Gregory XVI. protested in his Encyclical of Aug. 15, 1832. And his successor in the Sylabus of Dec. 8, 1864, condemned the proposition which asserted that the bond of marriage was not by natural law indissoluble, and that valid divorce might be granted for various causes by the civil power. The Apostolic Constitution Arcanum Divine Sapientiae, of the present Pontiff, promulgated on Feb. 10, 1880, may well be called an exact compendium of the Catholic doctrine concerning marriage, and a complete refutation of the errors spread to it. Since then, he has repeatedly proclaimed that divorce is a profanation of the sanctity of Christian

marriage and the ruin of the very foundation of domestic society; that through it there exist only adulterous unions, and never lawful marriages.

Moreover, rational ethics and the true science of jurisprudence, whether we consider the case of the individual or of public society, condemn divorce. Reason, experience, the authority of eminent men well qualified to judge, as well in philosophical sciences as judicial, demonstrate with absolute evidence that divorce is repugnant to the principles of morality and justice, and is the ill-omened source of immense evils, to individuals, to families and to civil society. As Pope Leo has declared, "Marriages are thus rendered unstable, mutual confidence is restrained, there is a temptation to infidelity, the well-being and proper education of children is jeopardized, there is a constant incentive to the disruption of family life, the seeds of discord between families are sown, the dignity of woman is debased, for she will be sought only for the gratification of low passions and then abandoned."

A special wrong may be mentioned in the case of civil divorce from mixed marriages. Here the non-Catholic contracting parties are allowed by the State to marry again, and such ensuing civil marriages are protected by the laws. But the Catholic parties are not allowed to marry again, and thus are left without the protection which civil law affords to those who enter into the marriage contract legitimately. In this case, the non-Catholic divorced persons are allowed to profit by their own excesses.

What shall we say of the children? Their education belongs to the parents by the law of nature. They need the father's firmness and labor with the mother's love and ceaseless care. The cruel separation of spouses destroys the training and the future of children. The Catholic Church has never ceased to protest against divorce. She has never sanctioned the dissolution of a valid and consummated marriage. There may be calamities to the contrary; but they are absolutely devoid of truth.

TRIBUTE TO THE CHURCH.

Taken From the Report of Dutch Reformed Church, Australasia.

The report of the third meeting of the Dutch Reformed Church at Batavia, Australasia, gives a splendid testimonial to the Catholic clergy in that far-away land.

It cannot be denied, says the report, that Rome makes an alarming headway in the East Indies. United like the Macedonian phalanx, the Catholics keep moving on, gaining victory upon victory.

The organization of the Roman Catholic Church is much superior to ours. Whilst the president of our ecclesiastical synod is forced upon us by the government, the head of the Roman Church is a Bishop appointed by the Holy See and recognized by the State. This Bishop is always a man who grew up with the country, who enjoys a serious authority and who governs with a firm hand.

The disinterestedness of the priests is truly admirable. They share like brothers the salaries which the state pays to a few of them. Their zeal in visiting the hospitals and prisons is worthy of all praise. The army is unanimous in lauding their cordiality and spirit of sacrifice.

These priests, rich in courage and conviction, see the number of their adherents increase everywhere. They know even how to take advantage of the materialism and indifference prevailing in these countries. This is especially the case in mixed marriages. Protestants, indifferent to their own religion, conform themselves to the demands of Catholic parents and permit their children to be raised in the Catholic religion.

The Church of Rome concentrates all its energies upon youth; she has schools in all the cities. These schools are of an all-round excellence; every body feels them in great esteem, and not few are the Protestants who do not fear a Catholic college education for their children. The Sisters educate the girls confined to their care with a skill commanding admiration; and it is a rare thing to find one of their pupils not speaking sympathetically of their religious teachers.

To Fair and Fearless.

Rev. J. L. M. Campbell, a Protestant minister and editor of the Southern Banner, of Dallas, Texas, a new publication, writes thus in his salutatory:

"The editor of the Southern Banner belongs to a Protestant family. His father had more than ordinary devotion to the old Presbyterian creed—Bible reading was with them a family institution. Brought up among Catholic people, often in the intimacy of friendship, the undersigned editor realized in his youth that Catholics were grossly misrepresented. A large experience with non-Catholics convinced him that a very great number of them are men and women of great moral and intellectual worth, fair-minded and ever ready to acknowledge truth, wherever it may be shown to them. Many of this class are often making inquiries with Catholic people about their religion. To answer these questions to which often a non-theologian cannot respond, the Southern Banner in part makes it appearance. There is a class, mainly composed of preachers, who distort the doctrines of the Catholic Church, through ignorance. The Southern Banner, if they will it, will enlighten them. Finally, there is the doctrinal or moral wretch, Protestant or renegade, that makes it his business to desecrate the temple of truth by infamous lies of all kinds, and these the sacred Banner intends to lash out of their turn the temple of truth into a cavern of thieves. The editor is the sole party responsible for utterances contained in the Southern Banner. His motto: 'Impartial in thought, fearless in utterance.'"

WHITEWASHING HENRY VIII.

Efforts to whitewash Henry VIII. are occasionally made by historians. James Anthony Froude, it will be remembered, made a hero of Henry, much to the amusement of unbiased readers and writers of history. A book, "Henry VIII.," by A. F. Pollard, recently published in London, while it does not go quite to such lengths as Froude in extolling the wisdom and virtue of Henry, tries to place the monarch of many wives in as favorable a light as his character will admit. The book reviewer of the London Athenaeum, commenting on this, remarks:

"There is a good deal to say for the theory that in his early years Henry was animated by generous impulses, and he was certainly popular at the beginning of his reign. But it is another thing to tell us that he was not degraded afterwards by an insane passion; that he did not advance farther in the path of conjugal infidelity; that after having at least two undoubted mistresses he sought a divorce from his first wife really for conscience sake; that 'it was his conscience that made Henry so dangerous,' and further that in constitutional matters he was a champion of liberty, not at all the sort of king who established a virtue absolutism by packed Parliaments."

The Athenaeum points out further flaws in the picture of Henry as presented by Mr. Pollard, and views with disfavor the author's endeavor to exalt the King at the expense of Cardinal Wolsey, remarking that the "general reader, no matter how unversed in diplomatic history, will not readily take Mr. Pollard's word for it that the Cardinal was a blunderer in statesmanship," whose "policy was an anachronism."

A writer who talks in this way, continues the Athenaeum, will hardly be listened to with respect when he avers that there "never was a flimsier theory than that the divorce of Catherine was the sole cause of the break with Rome." This is a familiar way of discrediting the Pope's attitude on Henry's appeal for divorce. Mr. Pollard states that Henry had really convinced himself "that to continue to live with his brother's wife (Catherine) was a sin, but the Athenaeum neatly offsets that theory by showing from Mr. Pollard's own words how insincere were Henry's convictions on this matter. Mr. Pollard says that he (Henry) "told the papal nuncio in England that although he had studied the question of the Pope's authority, and retracted his defense of the Holy See, yet possibly Clement might give him occasion to probe the matter further still, and to reconsider what he had originally written." The Athenaeum's comment is: "No doubt of it. If the Holy Father only would have granted Henry his divorce, how zealously would not Henry have recalled his words, and maintained once more the Holy Father's authority? There never was a mind so open to conviction—when good inducements were held out to him for a change of view."—Sacred Heart Review.

PRIEST'S ADDRESS BEFORE THE W. C. T. U.

Remarks of the Very Rev. Frank A. O'Brien as Reported in the Kosary Magazine.

You have asked me to tell you in ten minutes what the Catholic Church is doing for the temperance cause. There are about one thousand societies banded together, uniting about one hundred thousand members, under the banner of the Catholic Total Abstinence Union of America. Branch societies of this union are in nearly every State. One hundred thousand men pledged in this great cause of total abstinence means much; it is, however, but a small portion of the work of the Catholic Church for the cause.

You can never curb the will of a man by force. Influence must be brought to mould that will. The earlier the will is brought under submission, the greater is its possessor. The child is more than a million children in the parochial schools in this country. From their youthful years they are trained to self-denial. No meat on Friday, doing without sugar during Lent, etc., all this helps them realize that there is virtue in self-denial. This is established in youth. Conquering self brings with it more than earthly reward. The knowledge of the practice of self-denial is a thousand times more beneficial than the effects of alcoholic charts and similar instruction in our public schools. I do not believe that the presentation of the evils of alcohol by charts, etc., is the best thing for the child. It brings the evil effects before the thought, "How can I prevent the effects, while indulging in the evil?" Where the love of the virtue is not instilled there is no object for self-denial.

About the age of twelve the Catholic child is instructed for its first communion. At that time it takes the total abstinence pledge until it reaches the age of twenty-one. In many places the pledge against using tobacco is also given. Thus the dangerous time of life is bridged over. These promises are, as a rule, kept, especially when the child is separated from evil companions.

The child is guarded through life. The confessional, where intimate relations exist between the priest and penitent, is made use of to instill into the heart of all the love of the virtue of temperance. It is difficult for a man to acknowledge that he is a drunkard, but in the confessional such acknowledgment is made. The priest uses his utmost endeavor to have the penitent practice the virtue of temperance; if necessary, urges a "virtue of total abstinence."

Remaining faithful to the precepts inculcated by the Catholic Church, there is no danger of intemperance. You tell me that there are Catholics who are drunkards. Are they practical Catholics, receiving the sacraments as they have been directed?

You tell me that there are Catholic saloon keepers. I deny the charge. The confessional reaches the saloon-keeper as well as the drunkard. I will

admit, however, that there are a number of both classes who call themselves Catholics, but are they practical Catholics? The amount of their Catholicity is, as a rule, being buried from the Church. They do not fulfill the laws required by the Church for active membership.

I hold that a saloon keeper cannot be a practical Catholic. He cannot live up to the rules of the Catholic Church and remain in the trade. The Church forbids him to sell to minors, to drunkards or to people whose families would suffer from the loss of the money expended. It obliges him to keep the laws, to sell pure goods, pay his just debts. It obliges him not to be a cause of sin to his neighbor or a bad example to his children. When a saloon keeper endeavors to follow these rules there is "nothing in it" for him, and he gets out of either the Church or the saloon.

The Church does not hold that alcohol is bad in itself, for this is not true. It does teach that the abuse of alcohol is sinful and obliges its children under pain of damnation to avoid its abuse. For priests continually seek after the weak brethren to encourage them, have them take the pledge for a short time, a year, for instance, and then get around before the end of the year to see that it is renewed. It makes use of the sacraments and such other helps that it has towards the furtherance of the practice of this great virtue. It accomplishes more for the practice of this virtue of temperance than all other sources combined.

The cause of drunkenness is infidelity. Make men followers of Christ and you will make them sober men.

We must not forget that there are more than sixty million of men and women in this country who have no form of religion whatever, who know not God. As long as this great body is in the majority, and it is, we fear, growing in number every day, we cannot expect a general practice of the virtue of temperance.

Many of the vast number glory in the "liberty of getting drunk if they like."

How are we to reach this vast army? The answer is easily told. Make them Christians. Becoming the followers of the lowly Nazarene will not only cure the vice of drunkenness, but other vices equally as grave.

A DISCREPANCY IN STATISTICS.

It is a common saying that figures cannot lie. They can be very deceptive, though. Their reliability depends upon those who make them. The figures of statisticians do not as a rule inspire confidence. In fact, to lie like statistics has become a byword. The Catholic population of the United States is variously estimated at from seven to fifteen millions. One of these extremes must, of course, be an absurdity. Surely there ought to be some way of arriving at approximation in simple a matter. There would no doubt be less discrepancy in the estimates if the statisticians were to come to some agreement among themselves as to those whose heads should be counted. In some cases only practical Catholics are included, those who "neglect their Easter duty" and do not rent pews being regarded as outsiders. We have the assurance that nominal Catholics in France now outnumber ten to one, those who practice their religion. Every one knows that there are no better Catholics in the world than the good Catholics of France, to use a French construction. Those who are not good are apt to be pretty bad. They will oftentimes pretend to be infidels and act as if they really were. It is different with us.

There are a great many national Catholics in the United States who, though they have ceased to practice their religion, nevertheless love it, and in their heart of hearts hope to return to their allegiance. They do not deny the faith, and thousands of them are reclaimed every year. By far the greater number of these unfortunate know well the folly of trying to serve God and mammon; at present they are serving mammon and suffering accordingly. Another class, and a large class, will tell you that they cannot afford to attend church—that churches are for persons who can pay for pews, put money in the contribution boxes and wear clothes that are not workaday. This class must be sought out in the highways and byways and compelled to come in. They will never do so of their own accord. They have been frightened away, but it need not be told how. Let it be said that they have drifted away. These are the "apostates" of whom we hear so much from persons who know least about it.

If there are two words in the English language that have been overworked, they are heretic and apostate. Many persons are branded as heretics, who, if it were known, hold all the essential verities of the Christian faith. It is an injustice to call any one an apostate over whom the world or the flesh or the devil has secured a brief ascendancy.

For ourselves, we like the large figures in our statistics; and we think every Catholic, whether nominal or practical should be regarded as a member of the Church. To count out all the strayed sheep would be to drive them farther from the fold, and give the hireling all the more power over them. God forbid that those who have fallen away should lose hope of returning; and let those who heed lest they stray!—Western Watchman.

Every time you surrender to doubt, anger, fear, jealous envy, of whatever you know to be wrong, you simply augment the fault you despise. You are adding more fuel to the flame, instead of putting it out. If you keep the fuel away from the fire, it will go out, because there will be nothing on which it can feed.—Success.

Jesus Christ was, both during His life and at His death, an exact observer of the praiseworthy laws and customs of His country, even of those from which He knew Himself to be most exempt.—Bossuet.