

## The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.50 per annum.  
United States & Europe—\$2.00. " "  
Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.B.  
Editors—Rev. James T. Fox, R. B.  
Tos. Coffey, L.L.B.  
Associate Editors—Rev. D. A. Casey  
H. F. Mackintosh

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order.  
Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Ogdensburg, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Messrs. Luke King, P. J. Neven, E. J. Broderick, M. J. Harty, W. J. Milne, Mrs. W. E. Smith, Miss Sara Hanley and Miss O. Herringer are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the Catholic Record.  
Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.  
Special notices such as "favors received," etc., 50 cents.  
Advertisers changing residence will please give old as well as new address.  
In St. John, N. B., single copies may be purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 249 Maine street.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION  
Apostolic Delegate  
Mr. Thomas Coffey, Ottawa, June 13th, 1905.  
My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper, have noted with satisfaction that it is directed with intelligence and ability, and above all, that it is imbued with a strong Catholic spirit. It strenuously defends Catholic principles and rights, and stands firmly by the teachings and authority of the Church, at the same time promoting the best interests of the country. Following these lines it has done a great deal of good for the welfare of religion and country, and it will do more and more as its wholesome influence reaches more Catholic homes. Therefore, I earnestly recommend it to Catholic families. With my blessing on your work, and best wishes for its continued success.

Yours very sincerely in Christ,  
DONATUS, Archbishop of Ephesus,  
Apostolic Delegate  
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA.

Mr. Thomas Coffey, Ottawa, March 7th, 1906.  
Dear Sir—For some time past I have read your estimable paper the CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published. Its matter and form are both good; and a truly Catholic spirit pervades the whole. Therefore, with pleasure, I can recommend it to the faithful. Blessing you and wishing you success, believe me to remain, Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ,  
† D. FALCONE, Arch. of Larissa, Apost. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 12, 1913

### THE LOAVES AND FISHES

"Formerly the main discussion centred around Disestablishment, but now that question occupied a distinctly secondary place, and the main conflict had been around Disestablishment."

Thus the Bishop of Hereford on the Welsh Disestablishment Bill.

Lord Kenyon, a bitter opponent, also seemed conscious that the Bishops' strenuous opposition to Disestablishment did not look well.

"This was really a layman's question," he said, "and it was not well that the clergy should be looked upon as fighting for the loaves and fishes."

In the Welsh Bill there is no provision made for curates. "Perhaps the chief criticism of the Bill," said Lord Beauchamp, "related to the fact that it provided no compensation for curates. The reason for that omission was the experience afforded by the Disestablishment of the Irish Church. The number of curates connected with that institution before the introduction of the Disestablishment Bill was 467, but it had jumped to 918 when the Act came into operation. The compensation paid them was 55,000 pounds a year, though many of them were without a university degree or any sign of being properly qualified from a theological point of view." He intimated that the noble Lords might secure any amendment they desired in this matter; but the Irish experience will hardly be repeated.

The Bishop of Oxford was remarkably plain spoken. He intimated that disestablishment might have to be faced in England also, though there was no present demand for it; and he apparently thinks that it would not be without its compensations.

"The Church was losing all that really belonged to profitable opportunities, and retained only fetters, shackles and bonds, which on every hand were increasing. The argument that an established and endowed religion ministered to the religion of the poor was one which, for his part, he could not accept. What did it mean in effect? There was a religion provided which all men might have without contributing anything. They all knew what this residual religion had come to. They could not fail to recognize that the Church of England was not the Church of the poor as was the Roman Catholic Church in so many parts of Europe, or the Salvation Army or the Primitive Methodists."

The Bishop closed by contrasting Disestablishment in France with this partial Disestablishment in England and generously recognized the heroism of the French clergy which should have compelled the admiration of the world.

"He could not help looking across the sea to the French Church. What interested him so much was the present spiritual revival in the French Church. It had passed through a great crisis—a crisis of Disestablishment and Disendowment. What attracted his attention was the magnificent loyalty with which in asserting its principles and spiritual claims, it displayed an extraordinary indifference as regarded its secular position and financial resources. They put their spiritual principles first and their secular privileges and their finances last. They did wisely. He regretted profoundly that when there was going on in the English Church a doctrinal disintegration unparalleled in

its history, when, if things went on as they were going now, it would not be possible in a generation to say what the Church of England stood for—that in such a period as this they were taking refuge in our historical institutions. They were trying to keep the Church of England together by flying for refuge to Establishments, what they ought to be ascertaining what their principles were and whether they ought to stand by them. He believed that that tendency to run away from principles was a great disaster; he believed that the Church of England would have done far wiser in this crisis if it had sought to make the Welsh people understand what it stood for, and shown far less zeal on behalf of its secular position or of its endowments."

One would scarcely believe that it was the same Bishop of Oxford, writing to the Anglican Abbot of Calvey, who placed first in his list of four conditions to be fulfilled before he would consent to act as Episcopal Visitor, the following:

"1. I believe I could not become Episcopal Visitor of an institution unless I had satisfied myself that the property of the institution, buildings, etc., were legally secured to the Church of England and were not private property such as might be given or left by an individual or group of individuals to any person or community without regard to communion with Canterbury."

REV. R. J. CAMPBELL'S IMPRESSIONS

In another column we give some impressions of France and Spain by Rev. R. J. Campbell, the famous preacher of the City Temple, London, England. Mr. Campbell is so very "advanced" that he can hardly, in any real sense of the word, be called Christian. Indeed he is known as the Apostle of the New Religion.

He is not then a biased witness; at any rate not biased in our favor. His experiences are far from bearing out the interested calumnies of a certain type of would-be "missionaries" to Catholic countries. His testimony to the robust faith and vigorous spiritual life of the Catholic peoples amongst whom he sojournd is doubly interesting.

If in Spain he misses the grimy thing called in England material progress, he finds that the "unseen" is very real to them, more real, I am afraid, than it is to many of us."

At Lourdes, he frankly acknowledges that medical testimony is unequivocal as to the facts "of cure after cure that cannot be accounted for by medical science at all."

Against the deliberate verdict of expert and experienced medical men, Mr. Campbell's guesses about "suggestion" carry little weight.

Altogether this fair-minded if very advanced rationalist minister finds that, viewed at close range, the condition of religion in Latin countries is very far from being as bad as it is often painted by sensational and hostile press agencies.

W. J. BRYAN'S CRITICS

At the St. Patrick's Day banquet in Washington W. J. Bryan openly and unreservedly gloried in the prospect of Home Rule for Ireland. Immediately the experts on international etiquette (who are found on the staff of every well-equipped newspaper) pointed out that he was guilty of a glaring indiscretion. As Secretary of State he was the Foreign Minister of the United States and as such he should have studiously refrained from taking sides on a question on which the people of Great Britain and Ireland were divided. As a private citizen this was all right but Mr. Bryan must now remember that he represented the United States of America, and be accordingly guarded in his public utterances. The Globe brackets Bryan and Mayor Hockin together and reads them a half-serious lecture on the responsibility of official position. All of which might have some point were it not that the United States of America had, through her representatives in Congress, already openly and unreservedly congratulated Ireland on the occasion of the passage of Home Rule in the British House of Commons.

Even though Mr. Bryan cannot divest himself of his official character in his public utterances, what has he said that had not been already very emphatically said by Congress?

Perhaps it was this: "When the House of Lords is compelled to bow to the people, it will mean the beginning of Home Rule for the whole earth. It will be a tremendous triumph for Ireland and her part in the great struggle will be gratefully remembered by every country that is struggling for freedom."

Must the Secretary of State for America be silent, or mention De-

mocracy only in an apologetic way?

The sympathy of all America was with Ireland in the long dark days of heroic struggle, all America thrills in the hour of Ireland's tremendous triumph. The American national representative assembly had given expression to the feeling of the nation. If in such circumstances international etiquette would impose silence on the American Secretary of State on an occasion when it was eminently appropriate, if not necessary, to refer to the greatest event in recent history, then international etiquette is occupied with some very final distinctions.

It was safer, however, to attribute Mr. Bryan's declaration to an indiscreet ebullition of Celtic fervor than to emphasize by calling into question the action of the United States Congress.

It would not have been dignified for the Secretary of State to enter into controversy with his critics; but Mr. Bryan's answer was in keeping with his official dignity—he repeated the words two days afterwards in Chicago.

ORIGINS OF CANADIANS

Bulletin XIII. of the Fifth Census shows the origins of the people of Canada in 1911; in 1911, for in these days of rushing immigration the figures would, in many cases, have to be very much modified for 1913.

Persons of British origin were 3,896,985 in 1911 as against 3,063,189 in 1901; but they constituted only 54.07 per cent. of the total population in 1911, as against 57.03 per cent. in 1901. The Irish gained little from immigration, but still stand second in this group:

English 1,823,850, Irish 1,050,384, Scotch 997,880.

The total number of persons of French origin in Canada is 2,054,890 while the Germans account for 393,320.

British, French and German together make up 88.04 per cent of Canada's population. The other figures are interesting as indicating the trend of Canadian immigration.

Austro-Hungarians..... 1911 1901 Increase  
Scandinavian..... 18,378 139,103 110,725  
Semi-Scandinavian..... 31,942 107,515 75,573  
Jewish..... 16,131 75,085 58,954  
Italian..... 16,854 45,471 28,617  
Polish..... 6,285 33,365 27,080  
Dutch..... 33,845 54,986 21,141

Bulgaria is so much in the world's eye that special interest attaches to the fact that Bulgarians and Rumanians increased in the decade from 354 to 5,875. The grouping together of Bulgarians and Rumanians is not a happy one. The former are Slavs, the latter Latins. In the *Nineteenth Century*, March, J. Ellis Barker says: "The Rumanians are the direct descendants of these Roman settlers. Their language closely resembles Latin. Racially they form a Romanic island in a Slavonic ocean. A comparison of the small, wiry, alert Rumanians with their neighbours, the large-bodied, heavy and phlegmatic Bulgarians, is ethnologically very interesting. The Rumanians claim to be the Frenchmen of South-Eastern Europe. Young Rumanians who wish to study abroad go preferably to France. French is spoken universally in Rumania society, which is French in its manners and sympathies." In Rumania proper there are 8,000,000 Rumanians and in the neighboring states 6,000,000 more. It may easily be that Canada should get a very large immigration from these countries, and it would be desirable in future to classify Rumanians apart from their Slavonic neighbors.

In Ontario the French have increased from 158,671 in 1901 to 202,442 in 1911, a gain of 43,771; this gain is not only in the Eastern counties bordering on Quebec, but very largely in the North, for instance, the French population of Nipissing has increased by 10,843 and Algoma by 6,581.

The German element on the other hand has decreased from 203,319 in 1901 to 192,320 in 1911.

Ontario is receiving a large share of other non-British immigrants.

1901 1911  
Austro-Hungarians..... 919 11,971  
Polish..... 16,692  
Scandinavians..... 3,854 8,250  
Italians..... 5,233 21,265  
Jews..... 5,337 27,015

The Jewish immigrants apparently prefer the large cities, and to group themselves there in certain quarters; thus Montreal, St. Lawrence Division, has 19,256 Jews; Toronto Centre 12,157, and Winnipeg 8,844.

In the prairie provinces the French show a remarkable increase.

1901 1911  
Manitoba..... 16,021 30,944  
Alberta..... 4,511 19,825  
Saskatchewan..... 2,634 29,251

At first blush one might imagine that the Indian population had been devastated by a pestilence which raged particularly in Manitoba.

Table II. gives the Indian population for Canada as 127,941 in 1901 and 105,492 in 1911; for Manitoba 16,277 in 1901 and only 7,876 in 1911. But the mystery is cleared up when we note that half-breeds who were classified separately in 1901 do not appear as a separate class in the present tables; and for purposes of comparison the 93,460 Indians and 34,481 half-breeds of the census of 1901 are grouped together as 127,941 Indians in the present tables.

Evidently in 1911 when half-breeds were no longer classified as such, a large proportion of them chose to classify themselves as other than Indian.

Altogether the latest bulletin is very interesting. It indicates the difficulty but emphasizes the importance of providing for the remarkably large immigration that has apparently only just begun from Catholic countries. Happily self-interest, necessity and inclination all combine to impel these immigrants to learn the English language, so that when they are of the Latin rite, at any rate, the task of providing them with priests will not be an insuperable one.

Through Monsignor Budka, Bishop of the Ruthenian rite, the large and growing Ruthenian population will be very effectually provided for. It is somewhat difficult from the census tables to estimate their number; under the heading Ruthenian in 1911 it is only 29,845, but it is probable that the great majority of the Austro-Hungarian group of 129,103 are Catholics of the Ruthenian rite.

CATHOLIC OR ROMAN CATHOLIC

"A storm has been raised in the Roman Catholic community of India as a result of the issue of the Government circular laying down that the term 'Catholic' must not be officially used as synonymous with 'Roman Catholic,' because the claim of the Roman Catholic Church to universal Catholicity is disputed by other Churches on historical and other grounds. His Majesty's Government in India has now at length, therefore, rightly adopted the same line in regard to this matter as that of the Home Government. English law and the English state recognize the claim of the English Church to Catholicity and to be the Catholic Church in England instead of the Church of Rome."

The foregoing is taken from the Telegram. Some such item has appeared in all the papers. Curiously enough the term "universal Catholicity" appears in all of them so far as we have noticed. The wording of the document sent out by the Indian Education Department was not quite so bad.

In the official communication the term is "exclusive Catholicity," which if not a very happy one either, is a little more intelligible.

A leading Catholic paper of India, *The Examiner*, Bombay, thus answers the request to comment on the act of the Government:

"There is nothing abnormal or surprising in this. I am not quite clear at the moment when the usage began, but it was somewhere about the time of James I. I think. . . . We find the usage almost uniformly throughout government papers. . . . and seeing that the Catholic body has always acquiesced in the usage, and even to a great extent adopted it themselves, it seems difficult to find fault with the enunciation."

No sign of any great storm in that quarter.

The Examiner continues and notes an interesting fact that our secular press will not publish with display headings:

"It is true that the King-Emperor in his reply to the address of our Hierarchy, made use of the simple terms 'Catholic Archbishop' 'Catholic Church'; and that we saw in this a piece of delicate courtesy, rising superior to official traditions; and expressed our gratification accordingly (*Examiner*, Feb. 3rd, 1912). It is quite possible that this act of His Imperial Majesty may have attracted the attention of some of the High Church Anglicans and aroused their activity; and that the present official paper is the outcome of some agitation behind the scenes. If so, this may account for the quasi-theological explanation of the 'reason why' which looks 'inspired' and is perhaps somewhat gratuitous. But in any case, when once the point was raised in official circles, there could be no question what the official answer must be."

On the other hand the Catholic Herald of India protested against the circular, and several secular papers reproduced the protest. One of these, the *Indian Daily News*, in its editorial comment, is quite in sympathy with the Catholic Herald.

"The word 'Roman Catholic' is in fact an absurdity. It is analogous to talking about the 'local universal.' . . . But the question does not end there, for His Majesty seems to have had the tact to address the Archbishop of Calcutta as the Catholic Archbishop on the occasion of his recent visit. . . . This 'loose phraseology' seems to have been overlooked by the Governor-General."

A similar instruction was sent to the Post Office Department.

"We wonder," says the Catholic Herald, "what effect the whole of this comical incident will have on the good-natured Hindus employed there. To say the least, it is sure to bewilder them still more than they are too often at present. Not only as a rule are they innocently unaware of any Catholic Church except the real one, but even the word 'Catholic' beneath the name of a 'Reverend,' if not further completed, comes straight to our Catholic Cathedral."

Quite evident that even the Catholic Herald, though it protests, is in no "stormy" mood.

Reuter's agency to the contrary notwithstanding, the only storm in connection with the matter was the tempest in the High Church teapot that resulted in the issuing of the circular.

We have no intention of questioning the sincerity of those belonging to that section of the Anglican Church which professes to be Catholic and protests against Protestantism. But if they were to attempt to fasten the term Catholic on the Church of England as by law Established, then we should have a "storm" that would drive our "Catholic" friends to cover or wreck the Establishment.

The term "Roman Catholic" is not offensive; it simply connotes the fact that Catholics are in communion with the Centre of Catholic Unity, the See of Rome. But it is unnecessary. Catholics will be "Catholics" and the Catholic Church will be the "Catholic Church" the world over, in spite of any dog-in-the-manger policy of our High Church friends whose influence in the premises will not extend beyond official documents.

Quite apropos is the strong letter of protest which Bishop Courtney, and fifteen Protestant Episcopal rectors of New York have published against the proposal to change the name of their Church to "The American Catholic Church," or at any rate to drop the word "Protestant."

In the course of the letter occurs the following paragraph:

"We would further add that we are convinced that a name which would drive from us the best of the immigration would also seriously alienate the sympathy of twenty million Protestant Christians in our land who have to-day a regard for our church, which, with less than one million communicants, stands only ninth in order of membership. We cannot retain this regard by deliberately rejecting that part of our name which they consider the best proof of our relationship with them or by advancing extravagant and exclusive claims."

The American branch of the English branch of the "Catholic" Church may, between ourselves, be Catholic, but it is not prudent to proclaim the fact too loudly.

Lloyd George, during the debate on Welsh Disestablishment, invariably used the term Catholic instead of Roman Catholic, and no one in England or elsewhere had even a momentary doubt as to his precise meaning.

The Catholic Church is not very much disturbed over the danger of losing its name—except perhaps in official documents.

THE NEW ENGLAND HAS A NEW TIMES

The Times, London, England, The Thunderer, the bitter, unrelenting foe of Irish nationality, The Times of the Pigott forgeries, The Times that gloated over the depopulation of Ireland by famine, pestilence and emigration in the memorable words "The Irish are gone, gone with a vengeance," The Times that Tory England regards as the greatest journal in the world, The Times that reflects, also, all that is best in Tory England, The Times on St. Patrick's Day issued a 144 page Irish Supplement, "the tone of whose articles," says The Tablet, "is not only fair but friendly, and, what is perhaps more remarkable, buoyantly hopeful for all the future of the country."

The following is a quotation from The Times' Irish Number:

"The country is full of intellectual life and ambition. The land question all but settled, no longer swamps the minds and hearts of men in one primal passion. The nation is recovering something of its splendid youth. In literature and the arts there is a forward movement which already has produced conspicuous results. It is probable that much of

Ireland's future contribution to the Empire will take shape as a spiritual and intellectual stimulus."

Many Irishmen sympathized with the Boers in their heroic struggle a dozen years ago. So did many Englishmen, among them Lloyd George. Tories about the size of F. E. Smith or Sir Edward Carson tauntingly recall the fact as an argument against Home Rule.

The Times thus refers to the South African War:

"The defects of the Celtic character cannot obscure the nobility of the late Sir William Buller's character and the value of his work. In that campaign the Irish private soldier was worthy of his Irish leaders, and when Queen Victoria rendered thanks to 'my Irish soldiers' she spoke for a grateful Empire."

Some belated Tories both here and in England will surely think "The Times is out of joint."

"The tribute," says the Tablet, "paid to the services of the great Irish soldiers and statesmen and administrators who helped to make and save the Empire is ungrudging."

Good old Times!

Introducing the Irish number The Times speaks of "A New Ireland," but it is also quite evident that a New England has a New Times which refers to "the not very distant past which Englishmen and Irishmen alike are ready to forget." In this Irish number politics is eschewed; but there is abundant evidence that, in the opinion of The Times, impending civil war does not cloud the Irish horizon which is bright with the dawn of a "new era of happiness and prosperity."

The Irish fought and won some great battles and the Union Jack would not now float over so large a part of the world but for the valor of the Fighting Race; but the most stubbornly contested battle in the history of the Empire has just been won. The Times, the standard-bearer of the enemy, capitulates.

They may go out with all the honors of war.

An alliance offensive and defensive is being concluded. We have learned to respect each other. The time is near when, past bitterness buried deep, Saxon and Celt the world over "shall brothers be for a' that."

Then, indeed, will this prophecy of the Times be verified:

"If another great crisis should ever come, Irish genius and the strength of the Irish arm will be ready to meet it as of old."

Yes, "Come the three corners of the world in arms, And we shall shock them; nought shall make us rue, If (The New) England to itself do rest but true."

MRS. PANKHURST

Mrs. Pankhurst was convicted of counselling the destruction of property, and has been sentenced to three years' imprisonment.

Bonar Law, Carson et al, fomented bad blood and rioting in Belfast, and counselled rebellion. They are still at large.

Mrs. Pankhurst frankly admits her guilt:

"I deliberately broke the law, not hysterically and not emotionally but for a set, a serious purpose, because I honestly believe it is the only way."

Bonar Law in the House of Commons endorsed treason by stating in an impassioned speech that Ulster would sooner be governed by a foreign power than submit to a Nationalist Parliament. This statement was greeted with loud Opposition cheers.

Later, writhing under the taunts of Winston Churchill, Bonar Law interjected, "I did not quote the statement with approval."

Bonar Law might take lessons in manliness from Mrs. Pankhurst.

DR. McNALLY BISHOP-ELECT OF CALGARY

Last week the Ottawa papers published a despatch from Rome informing us that Rev. Father J. T. McNally had been appointed by the Holy See to the Bishopric of Calgary. Rev. Father McNally was a native of Prince Edward Island. He received his primary education there, and in 1890 came to Ottawa University. He was graduated from that Institution with the degree of B. A. with Honors in Philosophy, in 1892, and then went to Rome to complete his course. He studied in the Eternal City for some five years, taking the Doctorate in Canon Law and Theology. Upon returning to this country he was appointed curate of St. Patrick's, Ottawa. This position he held for about two years. He worked for some years in the diocese of Oregon, and during a portion of that time represented the Arch-

bishop in Rome. For some time he was pastor of St. Stephen's Church, Chelsea, where he exhibited remarkable administrative abilities, as shown in the valuable improvements he made to the Church. About a year ago Father McNally was transferred to Almonte, where he also did splendid service and showed again his remarkable administrative capacity. To his zeal for the beauty of God's House Almonte owes the distinction of having the most tastefully decorated Church in the Ottawa Valley. It will long be to the people of this parish a memorial of Dr. McNally's short but fruitful pastoralate.

The people of Calgary may be congratulated upon the appointment of Father McNally as their Bishop. In the great Western country he will bring to the performance of his high office a holiness of life, strength of character and a fatherly disposition, which will mean much for the spread of the Faith.

During the holidays of his student life at Rome he travelled extensively through Europe. The facility with which he mastered foreign languages was thus seconded by opportunity, so that it is not surprising that Dr. McNally is one of the most accomplished linguists in Canada. This is an invaluable qualification for his new duties as Bishop in the West which is filling up with a cosmopolitan population.

We feel sure that great as are the difficulties to be overcome, and heavy as the task must be, Dr. McNally's outlook will be beyond them to the vast opportunities that will be his in organizing his new western diocese.

The CATHOLIC RECORD sends Bishop McNally its heartiest good wishes and Godspeed; its congratulations are for Calgary and the West.

ARE YOU A PREACHER OF CHRIST?

Be not alarmed, gentle reader, I am not about to enunciate a new heresy. I am not even going to propound the old Lutheran doctrine of the universality of the priesthood. And yet I have asked you, "Are you a preacher of Christ?"

We read in the records of the life of the gentle saint of Assisi, that one day he called to his side a certain lay brother who was wont to accompany him on his rounds of charity, and said to him: "Come, brother, we will go out and preach a sermon." With eyes modestly cast down, and the peace and purity of their hearts transfiguring their every feature, they walked first along one street and then along another, apparently without any definite object or aim. Not a word was spoken, not a glance was cast upon the sights along the way. For an hour or so they continued thus, and then Francis said very quietly: "It is enough, brother. Let us return home." "But, Father," exclaimed the brother, "are you not going to preach?" "My brother," said the saint, "we have preached already. We have walked about with that modesty and recollection which becomes religious men, and thereby we have given a good example, which is of all sermons the most effective."

Bearing that little story in mind I ask you now, dear reader, "Are you a preacher of Christ?" I do not ask if you have had the sacramental monition laid upon you to "Go, teach the nations." I know well enough that such preaching is only for those who have been sent. But we have all of us been sent to preach Francis can sermons. "Having your conversation good amongst the Gentiles, that whereas they speak of you as evil doers, they may, by the good works which they shall behold in you, glorify God in the day of visitation." Since we are the light of the world we must let that light shine upon the dark places about us. Since we are the salt of the earth we must season the corrupting mass of humanity with the salt of our good example. We are the good leaven that is to leaven the whole mass. As Catholics ours is a terrible responsibility. We cannot live for ourselves alone. Whether we like it or not we are forever influencing our neighbor. If that influence is good, then indeed we are preachers of Christ. If that influence is bad we are preaching the devil's gospel, and that, too, far more effectively than he could do it himself. For the world never forgets that we are Catholics, and although in the words of St. Peter it "speaks of us as evil doers," yet, by some strange contradiction, it expects to see goodness and purity and truth exemplified in our lives. And if it is disappointed Christ is put to shame and the devil