

ready to accept the present state of the case.

But there is one circumstance which throws some light upon this matter. A bulletin has just been issued by the Census Department at Ottawa which informs us that notwithstanding that the population of Ontario is now one-third greater than that of Quebec, there are 13,021 more children under five years of age in the province of Quebec than in Ontario. In fact since 1871 there has been a remarkable decrease in the proportion of infants both in Ontario and Prince Edward Island. The ratio of natural increase must, therefore, be necessarily much larger in Quebec than in Ontario, even though the death rate of children is somewhat larger in Quebec. Under such circumstances, if at any time immigration ceases to be an important factor in the increase of population in Ontario, and emigration ceases to lessen that of Quebec, Quebec must necessarily advance with a much greater ratio of increase than Ontario, and after a time not only will the ratio of increase be greater, but even the actual numerical increase in Quebec. If Ontario is to keep the preponderance of population which it now possesses, there must be larger families. Hence we cannot but be of the opinion that the Mail and Empire is too dogmatic in its statements that the census has been dishonestly taken, and that Ontario is treated with injustice because it is to the interest of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's Government to inflict just such an injustice upon Ontario. If there has been dishonest work it should be exposed; but we should not assume that this has been the case without positive proof of that assertion.

THE REV. DR. BAYNE'S BLASPHEMOUS IRREVERENCE.

From the establishment of Presbyterianism in Scotland by John Knox, that system of religion has been based upon misrepresentation of Catholic doctrine, as it seemed that in no other way than by means of such misrepresentation could popular hatred of the Catholic Church be excited sufficiently to induce a people which was once Catholic to throw off their obedience to the precepts and teachings of the Catholic Church, in order to accept a newly invented creed.

Hence there were two doctrines of the Catholic Church which it was always the special aim of Scotch Presbyterianism to misrepresent as opposed to the honor due to God alone. One of these was the recognition of a supreme visible head of the Church of Christ on earth, and the other the veneration due to the Saints of God as His special friends and servants. In regard to these two teachings the Catholic Church is represented in the Presbyterian Confession of faith and the Catechism taught to Presbyterian children as idolatrous. The Pope is declared to be the "anti-Christ" and the "Man of Sin," who, according to the Apostle St. Paul, "set himself above all that is called God."

The Presbyterian General Assembly of the United States has practically admitted the falsity of this assertion in eliminating this article from their Creed by a surprisingly unanimous vote, which is an admission that they and their forefathers have been in error for three centuries. May we not reasonably suspect that they have been equally in error in accusing Catholics of idolatry for honoring God's Saints, even though they have not yet honestly admitted their error on this point?

The Canadian Presbyterians are apparently much slower than their United States brethren in arriving at the truth, for they still cling to the error of their ancestors in regard to the Pope, which was many years ago declared by the late Rev. Dr. Schaaf, one of their most eminent American divines, to be founded upon a wrong interpretation of Scripture.

We are, therefore, not greatly surprised that when the whole Canadian Presbyterian Church is so slow to come back to the truth, some of its clergymen should be still steeped in the antiquated and nauseous bigotry of the "Praise-God-Barbours" age, and should still be so ignorant of Scripture and the constant teaching of the Catholic Church as to maintain that in honoring the Blessed Virgin Mary, the Mother of God made man, Catholics are guilty of idolatry.

This absurdity was maintained in a lecture or address delivered in St. Andrew's Church in this city on Wednesday evening last week by the Rev. Dr. Bayne of Pembroke, the subject of his address being "Christian Science."

Surely, in order to show the absurdity of so-called "Christian Science," it was not necessary to misrepresent the teaching of the Catholic Church, which has nothing in common with "Eddyism" and its errors; yet the Rev. Dr. Bayne is so full of hatred of the only Christian Church which has come down to us from the days of Christ and His Apostles, that he must throw mud at it

while refuting Eddyism, which is certainly one of the varied offshoots of the palmary Presbyterian doctrine of private interpretation of Scripture, but in no sense an offshoot of Catholic faith.

The Rev. Mr. Bayne spoke of the position of Mrs. Mary Baker G. Eddy in Christian Science. He said:

"Mrs. Eddy is the author and founder, the central figure and the court of final appeal. Her word is final. She is indeed all but worshipped, and it would scarcely be going beyond the mark to say that by many she is actually worshipped. The whole scheme has many of the aspects of idolatry about it."

The rev. doctor then quoted from the account of a pilgrimage to Mrs. Eddy's home at Concord, New Hampshire, and declared that "if the English language means anything, here we have a new popery, another deified Mary."

We do not hesitate to characterize this flippant comparison between Mary the Mother of God and an American impostor as a piece of blasphemy unworthy of any one who claims to be a Christian, much more a minister of the Christian religion.

The ever-adorable Trinity honored Mary the Mother of God, by sending an archangel to pay her homage, and, according to the Protestant version of the Bible, the archangel (Gabriel) thus spoke to her:

"Hail, thou that art highly favored, the Lord is with thee: blessed art thou among women. . . . Fear not, Mary, for thou hast found favor with God;" or "grace with God," according to the margin of the revised version.

This address is more accurately rendered in the Catholic version: "Hail, full of grace;" for this is what is signified by the Greek "*kecharitome*," which is equivalent to "formed in grace."

Under what pretext can a Christian minister assert that it is one and the same thing to honor Mary, whom God has honored, and to honor any other human being? According to Scripture we must "honor the King," and even our parents. Hence we would undoubtedly honor the mother of the King, at least for the King's sake, if not for her own. But Mary is the mother of the King of Kings: she is full of grace; and is also without a doubt constituted our mother when Christ on the Cross makes her the mother to His beloved disciple St. John and requires her to be regarded by that disciple with the reverence due to a mother. (St. Jno. xix.)

But Mary herself declares the dignity to which God has raised her when she says:

"My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour, for He hath regarded the humility of His handmaid; for behold from henceforth all generations shall call me blessed. For He that is mighty hath done great things to me and Holy is His name." (St. Luke, i.)

We must infer that the Rev. Dr. Bayne and his sect, so far as they agree with him in his disrespect of Mary, whom Elizabeth, "filled with the Holy Ghost," declares to be the "Mother of my Lord," do not belong to the generation of prophecy who call her "blessed."

We have no adverse comment to make on the Rev. Mr. Bayne's refutation of the falsely called "Christian Science," which is but a delusion, and is neither Christianity nor Science; for this very reason it is a blasphemy to compare the quasi-deification of Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy with the proper reverence which Catholics manifest for the Mother of God, born into the world to be the Saviour of mankind.

The Man of Salvation.

Who can measure the height and depth, the length and breadth, of the interests of the Sacred Heart? They are as high as the heavens, and deep as the forces of darkness, broad and long as the universe. They are not confined to the home or the church or the school, to prayer and the sacraments. No; they are commensurate with the great plan of salvation itself, which was conceived by the divine mind from all eternity, was executed by the divine Son in the flesh, and is, and shall be, continued by His Church on earth unto the end of time.

"Evidence" Against the Friars.

Writing to the editor of the Evening Post, New York, a correspondent says: "Let me give you a sample of the way in which 'evidence' is manufactured against the friars. A young physician—whose name and address are at your disposal if required—who has just returned from the Philippines, happened to be present in a Manila court room when some native priests were on trial for an alleged offense. Next day the Manila Times gave an account of the trial, saying that the culprits were the friars. Our young American called the friars' attention to the mistake and suggested a correction, but the latter merely smiled as he said: 'That is not our policy.' And no correction was made. The Manila editor has evidently been studying American journalism."

In asking for favor we ask for all that we can need for it is the crown of all gifts and virtues. It is the beauty and the glory, as it is also the continual safeguard and purifier of them all.

THE CATHOLIC AND SECRET SOCIETIES.

New Century.

Not long since attention was called, in this department of the New Century, to a brief but excellent article, entitled, "The Position of a Member of a Secret Society Who is in Good Faith." It appeared in the June issue of The Dolphin, and it would be well if it could be included in its entirety in every Catholic Journal in the land. As this is hardly possible, it may not be without interest to record some reflections which that paper in the Dolphin has inspired on the part of the writer. In order that these reflections may have due weight with the reader, it is necessary for the writer to be somewhat personal and as the outcome of the indulgence of the reader is sought on that account. In order to render one's knowledge effective, it is sometimes expedient to speak from experience, and this with some, always savors of the personal equation to a disagreeable degree.

The most attractive Secret Society for the average man, which is under the ban of the Catholic Church, is that of Free Masonry. And yet, in spite of its condemnation Catholics are found within the ranks of its active membership, having by the act of entrance excommunicated themselves from the Catholic Church. The theory prevailing among Masons is that, "once a Mason always a Mason," and in this belief is frequently found the foundation of that spirit of injustice which occasionally shows itself against Catholics who have ignorantly become dis-obliterated to the teachings of the Catholic Church in joining the Masonic fraternity, and at a later period abandoned all active cooperation in its interests. Take a city like our own, with which one is familiar, the task would be comparatively easy to compile a list of demitted Masons who from various causes have absolutely relinquished Masonry. In order to be a full-fledged Mason it is essential to take the three degrees which constitute membership of what is called the Blue Lodge, or other words, to be a Master Mason. Comparatively speaking, few go beyond the third degree, which is that of a Master Mason; and I know of one person, then Rector of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, who entered the organization with me, and was so thoroughly disgusted with it and all that pertained to it, that he dropped Masonry instantly, and never again recognized its claims, except as beneath the contempt of intelligent men, with no worldly axes to grind.

It is quite natural to reach the conclusion that when an individual becomes a Catholic, who had been identified with Masonry, his acceptance of Catholicity was the all-potential factor entering into its relinquishment. This is far from true in many cases and as a matter of fact, Catholicity had positively nothing to do with the present writer's relinquishment of Free Masonry. Appreciating and approving the condemnation of that organization by the Catholic Church, Masonry, if one eliminates the idea of mutual assistance, has little in it to commend it to intelligent men; on the contrary its ritual is absurd, and its traditions are preposterous and unhistorical. One can think of no institution as widespread in these days, which is so pretentious in its claims to a remote antiquity as to origin, and is so utterly vague in these pretensions.

I remember hearing, years ago, a lecturer at the visitation of the Grand Lodge, purporting to teach that Masonry had its beginning in the Garden of Eden, and I turned to my neighbor next me with a sense of mortification that I was compelled to be numbered among his auditory.

Few writers could invest the tritest of topics with the variety and erudition of Thomas DeQuincey. In his Historical and Critical Essays he treats of Secret Societies, and at every turn one is amazed, as well as surprised at the badinage and scholarship with which the commonplace theme inspires him. "The two best known of all Secret Societies," says he, "that ever have been, are two most extensive monuments of humbug on the one side and credulity on the other. They divide themselves between the great ancient world and the modern. The great and illustrious humbug of ancient history was, the Eleusinia Mysteries. The great and illustrious humbug of modern history, of the history which boasts a present and a future, as well as a past, is Free Masonry." DeQuincey thoroughly understood the specious forms of the argumentum ad reverendum, and meets them as they must always be met. Masons will tell you of the great and good men whom their "Ancient Order" numbers among its members. Exactly so, and of what worth is all this vain boast? I intended to answer this inquiry, but on more than one occasion prefer to be in the shadow of DeQuincey's name, and therefore accept his words, and, so to speak, make them my own.

"The Eleusinia humbug was for centuries the opprobrium of scholars. Even in contemporary times it was such. The greatest philosopher, or polyhistor, of Athens, Plato, himself could no more tell you the secret—the *operation* (unless he had been initiated, in which case he durst not tell it) than I can. In fact, if you come to that, perhaps I myself can tell it. The ancient philosopher would retort, that we of these days are in the same predicament as to our own humbug—the Freemasons. No, no, my friend, you're wrong there. We know all about that humbug, as I mean to show you. But for what we know of Eleusinia and its mummeries, which is quite enough for all practical purposes we are indebted to none of you ancients, but entirely to modern sagacity. Is not that shocking, that a hoax should first be unmasked when it had been defunct for fifteen hundred years?"

"The interest which attaches to the Eleusinia shows, is not properly an interest in them, but an alien interest in accidents indirectly connected with them. Secret there was virtually none; but a mystery at length begins to arise—how it was that this distressing secret, viz., of there being no secret at all, could, through so many generations, pass down in religious conservatism of itself from all profane curiosity of outside of heresies, philosophers, statesmen, all hoaxed, all, of course, incensed, being hoaxed, and yet not one of them is known to have blabbed."

In this delightful way DeQuincey discourses of the greatest modern hoax, the humbug of Freemasonry, and thousands of men in our land who have been hoaxed by it, immediately drop it, and say within themselves—mum's the word.

The present writer has developed enough to show that he, like thousands upon thousands, was hoaxed, and when that was discovered, the Catholicity of late years but intensified a radical disgust with Freemasonry, as proving after all, that the masses of mankind "are but children of a larger growth."

A comparison between Masonry on the Continent of Europe and Masonry in the United States, might easily be instituted, for as a matter of fact, the former has been made the tool of political conspirators against governments, hence, men of profound thought everywhere regard Freemasonry as a menace to civil society. The spirit of the order of a Master-Mason is un-Christian, and in the light of Catholic teaching is so regarded. It is not uncommon for nominal Catholics, living in utter and willful disregard of the teachings of Mother Church, to join the Masonic Brotherhood for the sake of the worldly advantages to be derived therefrom, and the death-bed renunciation of Masonry is well known among us. A case of this kind was somewhat notable a few years ago, because the returning prodigal was rather conspicuous as a member of the Masonic body and rather conspicuous as a member of the Police force. One occasionally hears among Catholics themselves some little tone of exasperation in regard to disciplinary decrees against Secret Societies, while with others these very decrees are the manifestations of the highest wisdom. All Secret Societies are, *per se*, an evil, whose tendency is a menace to authority, both human and divine, and the Catholic Church knows whereof she speaks, when she sets the seal of condemnation upon them.

"The practical question," however, says the able writer in The Dolphin, for June last, "which confronts Catholics who are connected socially or in business with members of such societies, and non-Catholics who would gladly embrace the true faith, but are deterred by their membership in a secret and excommunicated organization, is this: Does not the fact—(1) that they joined the society in good faith; (2) that a breaking away from the association involves financial sacrifices of insurance benefits affecting their families as well as themselves—does not this two-fold fact admit of a mitigated interpretation of the laws of the Church?"

The answer, which the excellent writer presents so clearly, in the number of The Dolphin mentioned, is so important that I am unwilling to give the gist of it in words other than those found in the monthly, for they cannot be made more potent.

"We can imagine," he says, "a man on his death-bed who has been a member of a forbidden society, which, though he joined it in good faith, he would nevertheless be willing to abandon, making every personal sacrifice to that end. For him the present sacrifice, in a lingering sickness sure to end in death, is not, however, a personal one, but one demanded from his wife and children. The insurance is on his life. For twenty or thirty years he has paid monthly dues with a view to secure his widow and children against penury after his death; and this he owed them for the care and solace they gave him in life. Such circumstances call for an interpretation of the law that prevents injury; for if the law itself is intended primarily to secure or safeguard moral good, it is not to be used to co-operate in wronging those who are absolutely innocent and at the same time in dire necessity."

The case, as so stated, allows nominal membership under conditions which, it is claimed, are permitted by the Holy See. These conditions are given as follows:

(1) "That the person in question joined the society in good faith; that is to say, without thinking that it was wrong, and without knowing that it was a society forbidden by the Church."

(2) "That all scandal or wrong impression regarding such membership be obliterated among Catholics, if need be, by explaining to them the special reasons involved in the case."

(3) "That membership be purely nominal and passive; that is to say, that the person take no active part by attending regular meetings, etc., restricting his adherence simply to the payment of dues."

(4) "That an absolute severance from the society would really involve a serious injury to the member or to his family."

(5) "That the retention of the person's nominal membership do not entail the danger that he or his family be influenced thereby to sacrifice their faith and religion; and that no stipulation permitting Protestant funeral rites be admitted."

How far Catholics are justified in using such casual features of condemned Secret Societies is an open question. A. J. FAUST.

One of Curran's Witticisms.

Curran, says a writer in the "Green Bag," once had as colleague in a case a remarkably tall and slender man who had originally intended to take orders. When the Judge observed that the case involved a question in ecclesiastical law, Curran said: "I can refer your Lordship to the high authority behind me, who was once intended for the Church, though in my opinion he is fitter for the steeple."

The glory rendered to God is something so great, so precious, that the certainty or even the serious hope of co-operating with it ever so little, is capable of setting the soul of the Christian on fire.

FRANK AND FEARLESS.

Charles Welsh, writing recently in the Boston Transcript of the late Charles Kegan Paul, the famous London publisher, says:

"The said that to know Mr. Paul was in itself a liberal education. He was a man of refined culture and fastidious taste. His literary judgments were of the soundest, and his scholarship varied and profound. He was a fearless thinker and a frank and able talker. When I first knew him he had resigned his living at Sturminster Marshall because he could no longer subscribe to the tenets of the Church of England, and he was an out and out agnostic in the best sense of the word. Then he became associated with Mr. Frederic Harrison and the disciples of Auguste Comte, and I often went with him on Sundays to listen to the discourse of that famous apostle of Positivism whose voice we have recently had the opportunity of hearing on this side of the Atlantic. But Mr. Paul was not a man who was not a place for the logically-minded man who is honest to himself between Agnosticism and the Roman Church, and I was not at all surprised when he wrote to tell me that he had at last found refuge in the latter place. All his ripe scholarship, his fine judgment, and his eloquent pen were now as active in the service of the Church as they had been when he was at the other extreme. It was he who introduced Huxleys to the English-speaking public, and in his 'Memories' and 'Faith and Un-Faith' may be seen how varied were his interests in life, and how towards the close he centred them all on the Church where he had found rest."

Not so thrilling or so interesting, of course, as "The Confessions of St. Augustine," or Newman's "Apologia Pro Vita Sua," Mr. Kegan Paul's "Confessio Victoris" is a faithful record of a spiritual development, and deserves to be read by all who care to follow the workings of a soul which is searching for the truth. It is interesting to note that Mr. Paul declares as a sober fact that "Positivism is Catholicism without God." He never visited this country. If he had done so he would probably have given the world some choice phrases descriptive of the varied cults and creeds which flourish in our own City of Boston.

"My Sundays with Mr. Paul were the most pleasant of my recollections. One in particular I always recall with vivid delight. He took me with him to call on George Eliot at North Bank, Regent's Park. Her salon was always a 'stately reception' in which her talk was always well worth hearing," as Mr. Paul himself says. The famous novelist's physiognomy in repose was not inviting, and this, added to the natural sense of distance between so notable a person and myself, did not put me altogether at my ease when talking to her. But the subject of the right books for children came up—then, as now—the subject nearest my heart, and her whole aspect changed, her face became radiant and positively beautiful, and she said she thought the noblest mission of a publisher was to provide the right reading for the little ones."

MEN WHO TAKE THE PLEDGE.

From the New York Sun.

"The pledge is a fine thing, but don't take it too often or you'll forget, perhaps, that you've taken it at all. Just bear in mind that one good strong pledge well kept is worth a hundred broken pledges."

The above remark, the recent public utterance of a Roman Catholic clergyman, was made for the benefit of a young man's temperance society which had degenerated into an athletic club. Rivalry with brother societies had developed professionalism, and this in turn had fostered certain forms of victorious jubilation quite out of joint with temperance principles.

The idea seemed to prevail that the only thing a member had to do after infringing the society's pledge was to go to a priest and renew it. This simple formality would place the member again in good standing.

Many men visit a priest for the purpose of taking the pledge who never think of joining a temperance organization. No special type of humanity seems to prevail among pledge-takers unless possibly middle-aged laboring men, from thirty-five to fifty, who have families to support.

Professional men, such as lawyers, doctors and professors, are rarely known to take the pledge. Store clerks, bartenders, compositors and skilled mechanics of every description may be frequently seen among the applicants.

Often it happens that a man presents himself who is not a Catholic at all, but still insists upon taking the pledge from a Catholic priest. The solemnity of putting himself upon his knees and repeating the words: "I faithfully promise, with the assistance of God's grace, to firmly abstain from intoxicating drink for one year," is after all a serious matter.

Generally a year limit is set, but any term may be named. As a rule, priests object to giving the pledge for more than a year's time, having learned from experience that three and five-year pledges generally go to pieces within a month.

Sometimes an applicant will present himself who is already deep in liquor, and men on the verge of delirium tremens are proverbially very penitent and full of good resolves, ready even to take the pledge for the rest of their lifetime. In such a case the priest usually advises the unfortunate fellow to go home and take a good sleep, to sober up, go to confession on the following Saturday, and then take the pledge.

Many applicants present themselves for the pledge merely in order to get back to work after being discharged or suspended on account of drink. An employer will frequently exact the pledge as a sort of voucher for the man's good intentions.

Cards are specially prepared to serve as certificates for such cases, and these are duly signed by the clergyman. In some localities these certificates are

made out in the form of promises which the applicant signs and the clergyman certifies to; this signed promise is delivered to the boss and a coupon to correspond to it is retained by the priest. It often happens that a man who cannot be induced to take the pledge for a year will consent readily enough to take it until Christmas. Another favorite date for the expiration of a pledge is March 17, St. Patrick's Day, although there are many who will name the Fourth of July.

The man who takes the pledge until Christmas does not by any means intend in advance to start drinking upon that day. He merely foresees that he will meet a great many friends at Christmas, and he foresees also the consequent interchange of a good many greetings. Rather than run the risk of breaking his pledge, he seems to prefer to have it finish its own course and expire legitimately and honorably.

Very few of the old-timers are now alive to boast of having taken the pledge from Father Mathew—"the real pledge," as it used to be called, on account of its long formula and its stringent wording. Nowadays the form is simple and brief, and perhaps to some it does not mean as much.

The clergy regard the pledge as but an earnest of serious good intention, with no inherent or sacramental grace attached thereto. Its value comes from the individual's own self-reliant force of character, or from what Roman Catholic theologians designate *ex opere operantis*.

Whether the rank and file of pledge-takers coincide with such a view may indeed be questioned. Instances recur frequently enough to show that many who take the pledge seem to regard it as possessed of special inherent efficacy and think that it gets in its good work irrespective of effort upon the part of the individual.

A priest who was recently conversing upon this subject narrates that not long ago a man living in his parish came to the priest's house to take the pledge. The next day the clergyman, walking down town, met his parishioner staggering woefully along the street.

"Why, Thomas, what does this mean?" he exclaimed. "Weren't you up at my house yesterday to take the pledge?"

"I was your reverence."

"And why are you today in this condition?"

"I don't know, unless it be that when you gave me the pledge you forgot to put the power in it."

Archbishop Ireland's Song.

During Archbishop Ireland's recent visit to Rome he was often invited to pass his evenings at the Vatican with the aged Pontiff and some of the Cardinals. On one of these evenings the conversation having drifted to music and national airs, as expressive of the character and aspirations of a people, Cardinal Satolli, who during his stay in America had learned to know the Italian prelate, suggested to the Pope that he invite him to sing one of the Irish national songs. Of course, on such an occasion the desire of the Pope is taken as a command, and immediately after some members of the Papal choir had rendered Verdi's "Miserere," the Archbishop arose and sang a well-known Irish song, in his own inimitable voice, with such volume of resonance and feeling that it swelled and rose through the ancient halls of the Vatican those venerable princes of the Church were visibly touched. The Pope himself seemed stunned, and said to the Cardinals around him: "What pathos, what sincerity of feeling!" "Your Holiness," answered the Jesuit, Cardinal Mazzella, "it is not feeling, nor sincerity, nor pathos—it is Ireland's agony."—The Pilgrim.

A Protestant Admission.

From the Christian Advocate, M. S. list.

In this country at the present time we have a frankly secular (school) system. The Catholics do not like it, and we do not blame them for it. They are maintaining at a great expense their parochial schools. The Protestants send their children to the public schools: those children receive no religious education there, and in most families very little, if any, elsewhere, it is to be feared. What religious education is imparted in the Sunday school in the brief period of an hour, taken up largely by public services, our readers have perhaps a better opportunity to decide for themselves than we. The Catholics retain their people by the education of their children. Protestants send their children to Sunday school and not to church, and lose a large portion of them, both from the church and the Sunday school, before they are out of their teens."

For Non-Catholic Missions.

A gift of \$10,000 for the establishment of the Apostolic Mission House, an institution which is to be opened in this city for the training of Catholic priests as missionaries to non-Catholics and to the newly acquired insular possessions of the United States, was received during the past week by the Rev. Alexander P. Doyle, secretary of the Catholic Missionary Union, the organization having the work of the new mission house in charge.

The giver declined to allow his name to be made public. He is, however, a well-known priest who is greatly interested in the cause of missions to non-Catholics.—Washington New Century.

The hearts of saints have been consumed with the passion for God's glory. There is no happiness to be compared with that with which the satisfaction of this great desire fills the soul. It best suits all unite in this hunger for God.

The smallest act performed for God's glory is magnified, and when it reaches Heaven has become a beautiful offering for Our Divine Lord.

"Fail not," says the devout Blossius, "to offer your pious good works and pious exercises to the most sweet Heart."

Our good or bad fortune depends greatly on the choice we make of our friends.