

hostility to the state of affairs which now obtains, and an active if unobtrusive agitation in many places for the restoration of the Religious Orders. A writer in the Tablet recently gave an interesting summary of the widespread character of this movement. In Cherbourg, Toulouse, Amneville, Avignon, Rouen, Clamancy, and Grenoble for instance, to name only a few places, the nursing Sisters have already been restored, and it would seem that such a disposition in that direction is growing even in Paris, for the question has already been brought, or is shortly to be so, before the City Council by one of its members, M. de Puymaigre. Another, M. Alpy, moved some time ago that in every hospital a ward should be set aside for the admittance of Sisters at the request of patients. In doing so he was, he stated, actuated by motives of efficiency, economy and justice.

It is interesting to note that in this action M. Alpy had behind him various medical associations representing some twenty thousand physicians. The medical profession is in a better position than others to realize the need of the hour in this respect. One reason given for the support of the doctors to this demand is because they are harassed by the laws in regard to the personnel of private nursing homes. Another, we may be sure, is that they, better than others, know the effect of a religious atmosphere upon the occupant of a sick room. Whatever may be the immediate outcome of the agitation we may predict with confidence that the rank and file of the French people will not be satisfied until the present condition of affairs is terminated in at least recognition of the right of religious persons to minister to the wants of those whom sickness or misfortune has overtaken. That France should accord interminable predominance to the Masonic clique, under whose iron heel she at present writhes, is unthinkable.

YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION

The following from the pen of the Most Reverend Archbishop Ireland appeared in the first number of the Catholic Bulletin. There have been so many requests for copies of that issue—long since exhausted—that we deem it advisable to reprint the article for the benefit of all who have expressed a desire to peruse it and keep it for future reference.

Beyond question the Young Men's Christian Association has succeeded in making itself a power in America, and, we may add, in the world. In every city, almost in every town, in the United States, it erects its costly buildings and gathers to itself crowds of patrons and of clients. It reaches into our colonial dependencies—the Philippine Islands, Porto Rico, the Panama Canal Zone. Far beyond lands over which it flutters the American flag, it has its social centers, its edifices, its groups of workers. It is in Cuba, in several large cities of South America; it is in Europe, in Asia. Immense sums of money are needed to sustain it in this wonderful expansion; but those scarcely await an invitation to rush into its treasuries. In rapid diffusion of its agencies, in ambitious plans, and, we must add, in efficiency of methods in practical work, the Young Men's Christian Association stands without a parallel among American social institutions of present times.

An interesting study it were, to examine in detail the Young Men's Christian Association in its opportunities and in its methods, and read out the causes, remote and proximate, of its growth and power. Credit would at once be attributed to America itself—first, to its genius or organization and its management of projects, and next, to its lavish generosity in aiding movements believed to be philanthropic and humanitarian. In no other country could the Young Men's Christian Association have waxed so rich and strong as to-day it looms up in America. And, then, we should have to note the opportunity set before the Association by circumstances in our modern social organisms. In cities and industrial centers, the young men are legion, whom no well-constituted home, no immediate parental control, guards from peril or guides to safety along the pathway of sound morals and good citizenship. To harbor young men, bring them in reach of wise counsel, procure to them innocent recreation seasoned with encouragement to Christian manhood, must be taken as a most needed, a most praiseworthy work. To a work of this kind thousands of well meaning people will contribute promptly and liberally; and thousands of young men will readily put themselves more or less under its protecting wing.

Caring for unprotected youth is a blessed benevolence, to which none object, to which many are strongly drawn. Right here, however, enters the criticism we feel bound to make with regard to the Young Men's

Christian Association—a criticism from which in its present form of organization and methods it cannot escape. The Association in organization and methods is sectarian—Protestant. It is, in essence and in fact, what its authorized sponsors call it. Evangelical Protestantism. This is why it is not patronized yet more extensively than it is—why large numbers of young men hold themselves aloof from its class rooms and recreation halls; why many, as deeply concerned in the welfare of young men as any of their fellow citizens can ever be, refuse it encouragement and pecuniary aid. Worse yet—the Association because of this sectarianism is compelled, in the carrying out of its work, to mis-state before the public its character and calling—let us speak plain words—to mislead and deceive.

In appeals for contributions, in invitations to young men to take advantage of its hospitalities, the Young Men's Christian Association is a large-minded, unsectarian, philanthropic, social institution—aiming to afford homes to homeless young men, to guard them from evil, to uplift them in morals and good citizenship. To put its evangelical Protestantism into the foreground would wondrously restrict the power of the appeal; and so, for the time being, Evangelical Protestantism is hidden into obscurity. This is what happens, to a yet greater degree, in our colonial dependencies and the republics of South America, where Catholicism is dominant, where an institution avowedly Protestant would be doomed to quick failure. To insist only on a few recent instances: In the Philippine Islands, in the Panama Zone, in Cuba and Porto Rico, in South America, the Association proclaims in loudest tones its utter unsectarianism, and expresses surprise when the single-mindedness of its benevolence is brought into question, when Catholics make opposition to it on the ground of its opposition to their Catholic faith. In Porto Rico, where the Association is confronted by special difficulties on account of its sectarianism, it has gone farther than elsewhere in its professions of large-minded unsectarianism, and actually, we are told, has admitted Catholics into its local directorship. But in these professions of unsectarianism is the Association honest and truthful? Are not those professions as the runes of olden-time Goliath perched before the walls of besieged Troy?

A strict ruling in the constitution of the General Board of Government of the Association is that only Evangelical Protestants may be permitted to hold office of any kind in its directorships. A few years ago a few well-intentioned delegates to a General Convention of the Association, protesting against the constitution, put an almost unanimous vote defeated their efforts. In practice, universally so, in the books and pamphlets laid on its tables, in the Bible classes it organizes, in the whole atmosphere of its halls and class-rooms the Association is Protestant, a teacher and propagator of Evangelical Protestantism. Visitors and pupils may be urged, by word, to be loyal to their several church affiliations; but at the same time the association offers religious services of its own—an obvious temptation to the youth—those exercises suffice, that the Association is of itself a church, simple and undogmatic, yet all-sufficing to the requirements of Christian living.

In Catholic countries the methods of the Association are particularly dangerous. With Bible-reading and hymn-singing, with the ever present and insidious appeal to individualism in religion, the dogmas and the discipline of Catholicism are made to appear as an unnecessary burden, unauthorized additions to the pure Gospel. And what is worse, in those countries, the religion of the Young Men's Christian Association is put forth as the religion of America—the religion of America emblazoned by the splendors of the liberty and the material aggressiveness with which the name of America is so easily associated.

Catholics should have nothing to do with the Young Men's Christian Association. Now and then we hear the promise that the Association will alter constitution and methods; but the promise is not being fulfilled. What is this done, if ever it is done, the attitude of Catholics towards the Association may also be altered.

Meanwhile the question rises before the Young Men's Christian Association: Does it ostensibly sail under its true colors? Are its professions free of fraud and deceit? Should it not be candid and frank and openly declare that it is in all its parts, Evangelical Protestantism—this and nothing else; that it expects patronage, whether in money, or in frequentation of its halls, from Evangelical Protestants, not from others—especially not from Catholics?—Catholic Bulletin.

CAPTAIN SET PRIEST ASIDE CONDUCTED INFANT'S BURIAL AT SEA DESPITE MOTHER'S DESIRES

When the Cunard Carpathia, the vessel which rescued the Titanic survivors, arrived from Naples and other Mediterranean ports recently, some of the passengers, telling of the burial of an infant at sea, said that Captain Prothero, the commander of the ship, had refused to permit a Catholic priest to conduct the service despite the fact that the infant was the child of Catholic parents. Cap-

tain Prothero, who refused to comment on the matter, insisted upon conducting the service himself, according to several of the passengers. The child, Sander Oroz, eleven months old, according to P. Y. Gilkyson, of Boston, who was one of the Carpathia's passengers, died on last Friday morning. His mother requested that the burial service of the Catholic Church be read when the body was consigned to the sea.

There were two Catholic priests on board—the Rev. Charles Mackey, S. J., and the Rev. William Bush, Mrs. Oroz requested that one of them conduct the service. Father Mackey, the senior of the two clergymen, agreed to read the service. When the Carpathia had stopped at 8 o'clock on the next morning, Captain Prothero, it was said, refused to allow the priest to proceed with the Catholic service. Saying that as a British subject, and a member of the Church of England and commander of the vessel, he alone had a right to conduct the service. Captain Prothero read the Church of England service, despite the mother's desire that the priest should officiate. The child's body then was sent from the grating over the stern into the ocean. Five minutes later the Carpathia resumed her voyage.—N. Y. Times.

WHY I AM A CATHOLIC

I can not answer as an old-time Democrat did, and say I am one because my father and grandfather were, says W. G. Hume in the current number of Extension Magazine, for my paternal ancestors were Presbyterians and my great grandfather was a Presbyterian minister.

I am a Catholic, first, because I could not be anything else. By the process of elimination after investigating all the other creeds, the Catholic Church is the only existing religion that possesses the marks or attributes of the one true Church founded by Christ.

Every earnest Christian must admit:—First—that Jesus Christ founded some Church.

Second—that the Church of which He was, and is, the head was to last for all time and therefore must exist on earth to-day.

Now, according to my premises, the One Church of Christ can not be divided into many branches teaching different doctrines. Many good Protestants say that if we believe in Christ and keep His commandments, it matters not with what denomination we affiliate, unless—Oh, shades of logic—we are Catholics! If Presbyterians are right, then Baptists and Lutherans are wrong, for each sect teaches different things; and Unitarians certainly can not be included in a church of which Baptists and Episcopalians claim to be branches. The usual argument of many non-Catholics is something like this: "Yes, we admit that during the seven or eight centuries after Christ there was a Church which was founded by Him and which taught truly the things He told His apostles to preach. But in the course of time errors crept in and a large part of the Church became corrupt. Then the good members of this Church withdrew and united together to continue the early Christian Church and perpetuate Christ's original commandments as laid down in the Bible."

Without admitting the accusation, I will acknowledge that if all Protestants had united together and formed one Church, and if all the members of this Church believed the same things, their position would at least be more tenable. In this respect the Greek Church has an advantage over Protestants.

Following their argument, however, there is on earth to-day one Church, one form of divine worship founded by Our Lord Jesus Christ, and only one. Which is it? If it is not the Catholic Church, which Church did He found? Which of the many creeds and "isms" is the one true branch that perpetuates the early Church which is to continue until the end of time? Unless a Protestant can answer this question positively and at least to his own satisfaction, he has no excuse for remaining what he is.

The Episcopalians, I believe, are the only Protestants who seriously even claim a direct succession from the apostles, but they are obliged to trace through the "Roman Catholic Church," and they themselves in so doing admit that during a certain period the Roman Catholic Church was the true Church. "The gates of hell shall not prevail against her." If once the true Church, she is bound to be so still, otherwise hell has prevailed. If Episcopalians could show a true succession (which they can not), how can they reconcile high and low church, one claiming to acknowledge the Real Presence, and the other denying it. Can Christ's Church be divided against itself?

The direct apostolic succession has always seemed to me the simplest and at the same time the most vital test of any Church's claiming divine authority. Strange to say, most Protestants admit the claims of the Catholic Church in this regard.

One thing has always impressed me. There are, of course, exceptions, but in almost every case of which I have had personal knowledge this rule will apply. Luke-warm or bad Catholics are the ones who leave the Church, but our converts are good, earnest Protestants who are seeking truth and their eternal salvation.

Again, "By their fruits you shall know them." Look back through the pages of history and count, if you can, the mighty names upon the roll of the Catholic Church—just to

mention a few—St. Vincent de Paul, St. Francis Xavier, St. Ignatius Loyola, Thomas A' Kempis, Fenelon, Michelangelo, Raphael, Dante, Dryden, Newman, Manning, Spaulding. Is it not a privilege to be brothers in the Faith to such as these? Is it possible for such men to have been wrong in their method of serving God?

Protestants sometimes say: "I can not understand how Catholics believe this or that." Of course they can not; otherwise, if in earnest, they would become Catholic. Right here we come to the main point: Faith is not understanding, but believing what we can not understand. Help Thou our unbelief.

And give us grace to say like the repentant thief, "Have mercy, Lord, to-day."

Yea, help us to believe. And hope—to love Thee, too; Lest we at last ourselves deceive, Our failing faith renew.

We do not ask to see, Enough that Thou hast said, The path that leads to Thee.

The way that we should go, Enough that Thou hast said, Believe, believe in Me,

And ye shall even raise the dead, Cast mountains in the sea."

As a rule, non-Catholics do not seem to realize that if one acknowledges a Church of God through which He still speaks, and teaches, that whatever His Church teaches, that doctrine can not be entirely understood by men's finite minds; they must accept them, and Faith says "I believe." On the other hand, however, many of the devotees and practices of the Catholic Church help to strengthen our belief in her divine institution. I have always found that, even from a human standpoint, the more we study and investigate the Church the more we see how logical and how beautiful than more natural and beautiful than to believe that the Mother of God was the ever Virgin Mary? The mind revolts at the non-Catholic attitude toward the Blessed Virgin. Again, how can Christians dislike the Crucifix emblem of Christ's death for sinners? What a consolation to mankind is the Sign of the Cross, the pledge of our salvation. Or take the Sacraments, viewed merely as temporal benefits. Like a loving mother the Church takes us in infancy, and from the day she never relaxes her watchful care. She leads us gently along the path of life, ever ready with a shield in each emergency, and a balm for every pain. Are we wounded? She offers us the sacrament of penance, in which we may be healed. Then she strengthens us with confirmation and the Holy Eucharist. When we are grown and choose our state in life, there, awaiting our coming, are holy orders or the sacrament of matrimony. And at the end, when the light begins to fade, when the weary spirit falters and we long at last for rest, then, when Death approaches and the demon of discouragement strives to claim us for his own, does our Mother forsake us then? Nay, she stands by our side, gives us the Bread of life, anoints us with holy oil, and as she has led us from the cradle to manhood, and from youth to old age, she now leads us to the gates of that heavenly city which she has taught us to seek. Believing, therefore, that Our Divine Lord established a Church which exists to-day, I must either believe in and accept her teachings, or doubt the truth of Christ's own words.

So if you ask me why I am a Catholic, I answer: "Because I must be either a Catholic or an atheist."

"THE ONE SCOTTISH CARDINAL"

By the Rev. Henry Grey Graham, M. A.

The appearance of the fourth volume in the series of "The Archbishops of St. Andrews," by the Rev. Dr. Herkless and Mr. R. K. Hannay, places before the public a very different view of Cardinal Beaton from that which has hitherto prevailed, especially in Scotland. Dr. Herkless is Professor of Church History in the University of St. Andrews, and Mr. Hannay is Curator of the Historical Department of H. M. General Register House. They have compiled this biography of Beaton from original documents and State papers, and as a result of their calm and well-digested researches the Cardinal stands forth as an ecclesiastical statesman of the first rank and as an illustrious patriot, who by his commanding genius oversaw the Reformation till the hand of the assassin put an end to him.

It was more than time that justice should be done to the memory of "the one Scottish Cardinal." Both in popular and in serious works of history people have been taught for centuries without check to execrate his name as a monster of debauchery and a fiendish persecutor without one redeeming virtue. The falsifications of Lindsay, and Knox, and Buchanan, and all their school have been greedily and unquestioningly accepted. Beaton has ever been, in Knox's words, "that bloody wolf of the Cardinal," a vicious priest and wicked monster, who "neither loved the saint nor cared for the blood of the martyrs." But now a change has come. Sober and impartial students of the original sources of history, winnowing out truth from fable, and separating contemporary and reliable evidence from the fictions of

hostile romancers, have arrived at a correct estimate of this remarkable man as ever likely to be obtained, and the result is that they present him to us as a giant towering above all in political genius and statesmanship, the unwearied and incorruptible defender of his country's liberty and independence, who, in spite of the weakness and inferiority of the resources at his command, yet humbled the pride and baffled the ambition of the English Sovereign, and "yielded at last," as Mr. Lang says, "only to that ultimate argument, the dagger."

His life may be very briefly outlined. Born in 1494, of an old Fife family, the Beaton, or Bethunes of Balfour, he was educated at Glasgow and St. Andrews Universities, and trained in Canon and Civil Law at Orleans and Paris. In 1519 he was appointed Scottish Envoy at the French Court, and entrusted with several diplomatic missions. His uncle, James Beaton, Archbishop of St. Andrews and Primate of Scotland conferred upon him the rectories of Campsie and Cambuslang, and later the Abbey of Arbroath. In virtue of the latter dignity David Beaton took his seat in Parliament and in the Privy Council. In 1528 he was made Lord Privy Seal, and was one of the judges who condemned Patrick Hamilton. From this moment he rose to be the favorite and all-powerful adviser of James V., Henry's nephew. The King commissioned him to negotiate both his French marriages the first with Magdalene, only daughter of Francis I., and the second with Mary of Guise, who became the mother of Mary Queen of Scots. After James' death, Beaton and Mary of Guise were united by an unwavering friendship in their defence of the Catholic Church, their favor of the French alliance, and their resistance to English domination. One after another honors fell to the Churchman. He succeeded his uncle in the Primacy. He received the Bishopric of Mirepoix, a suffragan See of Toulouse, as well as considerable heritable property in France. At the solicitation of Francis and James he was created Cardinal by Paul III. Later he became Lord High Chancellor of the kingdom, and in 1544 the same Pope made him Legate a latere in Scotland. Short of being King or Pope, Beaton thus rose as high as it was possible for man to rise. "He stands in history," says his latest biographers (p. 28) "as the one Scottish Cardinal. Towards the close of the fourteenth century Walter Wardlaw, Bishop of Glasgow, was created a Cardinal by Clement VII, the first antipope of the Great Schism; but antipopes have not been recognized in the Roman succession, and their Cardinals have not been numbered in the Sacred College."

After his rise to power in the government of the realm, Beaton's life may be said to have been devoted wholly and solely to three great ends: securing the Church from her enemies, cementing the French alliance, and preventing Henry from capturing Scotland. With regard to his measures for the defence of the Church, perusing the dispassionate account of his activities by Dr. Herkless and Mr. Hannay, we find it difficult to realize that we are dealing with the same man as the Beaton of popular tradition, the ecclesiastical butcher finding his delight in wholesale slaughter of inoffensive victims. He put in force, indeed, the laws against heresy, though we can find only two or three occasions on which the offenders were handed over to the secular arm. The Scottish Parliament had passed acts requiring Bishops to make inquiry concerning the spread of heretics, and proceed against them according to the law. It was the accepted ethic of the age, and all authorities, both ecclesiastical and civil, and whether Catholic or Protestant, did it. But anything like the wanton cruelty and arbitrary butcheries for selfish ends which characterized the policy of Henry can never be justly laid to the charge of Beaton. Mr. Hossack, advocate, in his defence of Mary Stuart, does not hesitate to say (Vol. I, p. 13): "Compared with the innumerable victims of religious tyranny who perished under horrible tortures in England under Henry VIII. . . the persecutions of Cardinal Beaton sink into insignificance; and considering the age in which he lived and the power that he enjoyed, he probably deserves rather to be commended for his moderation than denounced for his barbarity." Beaton has earned peculiar abhorrence for procuring the execution of Knox—a "blissed martyr of God, Master George Wishart"; but if death in the last resort was ever to be visited upon heretics at all, Wishart could not possibly expect to escape. That he was directly a participant in the plot to murder the Cardinal has not, it seems to me, been conclusively proved, although there are good authorities (e. g. Principal Cunningham in his "Church History," and Dr. Herkless, in his earlier work, "Cardinal Beaton: Priest and Politician") who incline strongly to the belief that he was. But his crime as an open, and it must be added successful, preacher of the new opinions, leading to attacks on religious houses, marked him out as a dangerous rebel who must sooner or later be reduced to silence. Even he was not committed alive to the flames, and there are other evidences of Beaton's tenderness of heart, especially towards the poor.

That David Beaton was a saint no Catholic has ever ventured to claim (although his heresy-burning would be no bar to his sanctity). Even after making every allowance for the

exaggerations and inventions of his enemies, it is difficult to resist the conclusion that he shared in some measure the irregularities which were all too common among his class at the time. Morals were relaxed, and it were no marvel if even a prelate failed altogether to escape contamination. But that he was the profligate portrayed by the Knoxian school of writers can no longer be maintained, for there is simply no evidence to prove it; and it is satisfactory to note that such matters find very little place in the latest biography of the Cardinal.

But it is as the statesman and the patriot that Beaton appears most truly great. His life, especially after the disgraceful rout of Solway Moss and the consequent death of the heart-broken King, was practically a duel between Henry's all-consuming ambition and the Scottish Reformation, not only to the Reformation, but also to the English Crown. To attain this end he left no stone unturned, no means, fair or foul, untried. He plotted and bribed, cajoled and threatened by turns. He proposed marriages, sent ambassadors, posted spies. He endeavored to separate Scotland from the friendship of France. He tried to Protestantize his nephew James, to kidnap him, to make him plunder the religious houses. He worked hard to get possession of the infant Queen Mary. He fought, invaded, and ravaged Scotland. Worst of all, he approved and encouraged the murder of Beaton, and rewarded the assassins. All this is writ plain in history. Yet at every turn he was met and outwitted by the superior statesmanship of "the great Cardinal."

It is amazing to read of the ingenuity, the astuteness, the determination, and the vigilance with which the Archbishop of St. Andrews baffled the designs of the English monarch and his pensioners in Scotland. For Beaton had to deal not only with English arms and diplomacy, but with a body of Scottish nobles unscrupulous, self-seeking, and shifty to the last degree. Some of them were directly in the pay of Henry to further his interests; others were weak, vacillating, and unreliable. Many professed the Reformed creed with an eye upon the monastic wealth, and all were jealous of the clergy. After Salway Moss, for example, the nobles whom Henry had captured—Cassilis, Glencairn, Maxwell, Angus, and the Douglases—contemptuously known as the "English lords," or the "assured Scots," scrupled not, with unparalleled treachery, to enter into an engagement with Henry that they would deliver to him the baby Queen, the principal fortresses, and the Cardinal, and secure for him the lordship of Scotland. To defeat this combination of his country's enemies, Beaton devoted his commanding talents with magnificent skill, sleepless activity, and with a resourcefulness that has compelled admiration even from the most hostile writers. And not content with the arts of diplomacy, he again and again summoned his clergy, and together they subscribed thousands of pounds for the national cause, and offered to melt down their own plate and the Church plate, and even to fight, if need were, for their hearths and altars. The Cardinal himself fortified his castle, polished his swords, and headed the troops.

It is no wonder, then, that Beaton was everywhere hailed among the people as the champion of Scotland's liberties and independence, and that his imprisonment roused such a storm of indignation that he was quickly set free. He was the one man whom no power could crush and no money purchase. "In contrast" (to the traitors), write his latest biographers, "stood Beaton, who, even though the interests of the Church were his first concern, never, from the first day to the last of his public life, dealt treacherously with the independence of the realm." How gallant a fight," says Mr. Lang, "Beaton waged against adversaries, how many and multifarious, how murderous, self-seeking, treacherous, and hypocritical, we have seen. . . . Henry's failure was due to the genius and resolution of Cardinal Beaton, heading the Catholic party" ("Short History," pp. 90, 91).

"But even the greatest patriots are not immune from the dagger of the assassin. Beaton was in Henry's path, the one insuperable obstacle to his ambition, and so he must be removed. By the bloody deed of May 25, 1546—a deed long meditated and finally accomplished by men whose plans were known to and approved by the English Sovereign—there fell within the Castle of St. Andrews the fearless champion of Scotland's ancient Church and the invincible defender of her liberties. David Beaton, as his sympathetic biographers have written in their concluding paragraph, "was an ecclesiastical, the guardian of an institution with centuries behind it, a prince under the imperial sovereign at Rome; but he was also a statesman by the sanction of a custom which jealous rivals among the nobles resented. England was strong under Henry's rule, while Scotland, with political factions, was weak. In spite, however, of the divisions and jealousies of the nobles, independence was maintained by the resolute and incorruptible statesman who was a priest. The Church was not reformed after the English fashion, the French alliance was not broken, and the freedom of Scotland was not destroyed because the Cardinal of Scotland was the careful and skilful opponent of the King of England. The Cardinal was slain in his Castle of St. Andrews, and the King soon followed him by

another road into the darkness of death. Henry had failed in his Scottish policy, and David Beaton was the man against whom in the last years he had matched his strength."—*Tablet*.

TOUCHING EXPERIENCES OF A CONVERTED MINISTER

In the Irish Rosary, the Rev. Father J. H. Steele, formerly Protestant chaplain to the Earl of Erne, gives an account of the causes which induced him to leave the Protestant Church and become a priest of the Catholic Church. In his article he says:

"But the great crisis of my life was approaching, a combination of circumstances, wholly unlooked for, leading up to it. Among those circumstances, the foundation of a religious house by the Passionists in the County of Fermanagh, in the heart of the district in which my school days and early ministry as a clergyman were passed must be mentioned. The buildings were erected on lands which had formed a part of the inheritance of the abbots and monks of Devenish, and were situated within view of the sacred island."

"The resurrection of religious life in a region of such holy memories stirred me deeply, though at the time the Holy Congregation was only known to me by its beautiful name, and by the fact that J. H. Newman had been received into the Church by one of its Fathers."

"I read accordingly with great interest the reports of proceedings connected with the new foundation, named 'The Blessed Gabriel's Retreat' which appeared from time to time in the country newspapers, and in this way was introduced to that glorious young saint. Such imperfect sources of information only stimulated a desire which they could not satisfy; so I provided myself with a copy of his life by Father Ward, C. P., and a most charming volume it proved."

"The Blessed Gabriel soon became for me a 'stella rutilans,' shedding the sweetest influence from its fixed center in the firmament of the Church. If there had been no other light to lead me but that afforded by this star, I should have been guided out of the 'encircling gloom' by its light alone, to find my feet planted in the way of peace. In addition to the holy memories, upon which I had all my life been feeding my soul, I now found myself brought within the reach of a Living Voice ever and anon sweetly whispering 'Follow the gleam!'"

HOW CARDINAL MANNING BECAME A CATHOLIC

In a private conversation this great prince of the Church himself related the following:

"I was in Rome, visited the museums, the churches, and viewed the city from all points. I had never had the shadow of a doubt as to the truth of Protestantism and had not the slightest notion of changing my religion. Nothing of all that I saw had made an impression upon me, and I was as far from Catholicism as I was at my departure from England."

"One morning I entered the Church of St. Louis of France. The blessed sacrament was exposed on one of the altars, probably on account of a novena. There was nothing out of the ordinary; a few candles were burning, the priests, vested only in their surplices, knelt in the sanctuary; and a few of the faithful were praying in the church. Nothing of the pomp of St. Peter's was there, but it was God's time. I felt in my heart a mysterious emotion, partly illumination, partly attraction. For the first time in my life it appeared to me that truth might be here, and that possibly I might one day become a Catholic. But I was not yet converted. It was merely the call of God! and I was still far from the truth. I did not reject the call, but I prayed, I sought and studied with all the sincerity of which I was capable. Light increased from day to day, and grace accomplished the rest."

Considered from a temporal point of view, no conversion could have been connected with more disadvantages. There was for a clergyman and a scholar no more agreeable position than that of Archdeacon Manning. As a dignitary of the Anglican Church he possessed riches, influence and a prominent position; genius, fame and friends were his. These were all lost on entering the hated Church of Rome; but, as he said, he hearkened to the voice of God, calling him—Mainz Kath. Viksbl. 1880.

Friendship can sometimes show its strength as much by the readiness with which it accepts benefits as by the freedom with which it gives them.

7% BONDS PROFIT-SHARING

Series \$100, \$500 and \$1000
TERMS 5 YEARS

Withdrawable after one year.
Send for special folder.

NATIONAL SECURITIES
CORPORATION LIMITED
Confederation Life Bldg.
TORONTO