

RUSSIA AND TURKEY.—VI.

In all human history, including the ages of persecution and the irruption of the barbarians into Europe in the fourth and fifth centuries, there is no worse specimen of incarnate egotism, cynical injustice, and frightful cruelty, than the late Tsar Nicholas. His whole life was a persistent warfare against liberty, truth, justice, and mercy. If his own words and acts do not prove it, we may despair of proving anything. A popular English writer, not unskilled in the delineation of human character, gave this account of him:—"We were in Russia, when we came to visit our friends here, under the protection of the Father of the Church and the Imperial Eagle. This butcher and tyrant, who sits on his throne only through the crime of those who held it before him—every step in whose pedigree is stained by some horrible mark of murder, parricide, adultery—this padded and whiskered pontiff, who rules in his jackboots over a system of spies and soldiers of deceit, ignorance, dissoluteness, and brute force, such as surely the history of the world never told of before, has a tender interest in the welfare of his spiritual children, in the Eastern Church ranks after divinity, and is worshipped by millions of men." (1)

Most of the acts in the public life of this arrogant and cruel despot are indications, as Macaulay said of Frederick of Prussia, "of a nature to which the sight of human suffering and human degradation is an agreeable excitement." (2) The brutality of this man was not fitful and intermittent, nor limited to one class of victims, but incurable, impenitent, and all-embracing. Whoever differed from him in religion or politics was an enemy to be crushed. Nor could any sorrow appease his diabolical malice, however deep and intense, unless torture was added to it. When, in 1831, he sentenced Prince Sangusko, the head of one of the noblest families in Poland, whose only crime was religion and patriotism, to perpetual exile in Siberia, his savage malignity contrived to aggravate the misery of the noble victim by a method peculiar to himself. Seizing the decree of transportation, Nicholas wrote with his own hand in the margin:—"To be conducted into Siberia like an ordinary felon, on foot, and in chains." (3) One such fact suffices to reveal the character of the man, and doom him to eternal infamy, but a hundred such facts could not exhaust his vindictive malice. On one occasion he signed, "with imperturbable tranquillity and with his own hand," as one of his ministers sympathetically observed, "the deportation into the Caucasus of forty five thousand Polish families," all of the highest class; (4) and the barbarian author of this immense and wide-spread anguish deemed it sufficiently excused by his own well-known saying:—"I only know two sort of Poles, those whom I hate and those whom I despise." (5) On another occasion, it was reported to him that a gentleman in St. Petersburg had become a Catholic. "No must be insane," was the reply of the cynical savage, "let them put him in a lunatic asylum." And there he died. Such incidents form the warp and staple of his life. He could rage against the pious sectaries who abandoned his official Church, but the special objects of his voracious aversion were a Catholic priest and a Pole. Their unpardonable crime was that they denied his pontificate, as Fisher and More and all the Bishops of England denied that of Henry VIII. His habitual expression for a priest was a *Domine vocemum*, and when some one spoke in his presence of the science and virtue of Archbishop Holowninski, he cried out in a burst of passion:—"Under the brow of a Catholic priest I see always the mouth of Pole." (6) His hatred of both was maniacal. They refused to worship the fetish of "tsarodoxy," in which it was the first duty of every Russian to see the supreme object of Muscovite devotion, and therefore in the Russian firmament was written against them this permanent record: "Death or Siberia! In all Russia, under this ruthless despot, there was only one free man and he was the abject slave of his own evil passions. A Russian might break the law of God as often as he pleased, but not the code of the Tsar. "You and I," said Nicholas to one of his intimates, "are the only two men in the whole empire who are not thieves;" but while he saw with indifference his degraded subjects sunk in ignorance, corruption, and immorality, he had only curses for those who could have taught them, if they had been suffered to speak, that liberty and holiness are flowers which grow on one stem. His policy, as we have seen, and shall see more clearly hereafter, was as impotent as it was devilish; but while he lived, a single outbreak was of more potent authority in the Russian Empire than the Decalogue and the Sermon on the Mount put together. Only a nation of barbarians could bow their necks under a despotism so fatal to human dignity. But bondage to a self-elected master is everywhere, in the order of Providence, the chastisement of schism, and the scourge of spiritual revolt.

It was no religious motive, as his own character sufficiently proves, which impelled Nicholas to persecute his Catholic subjects, since they profess every Christian doctrine proclaimed in the Russian liturgical books, including the supremacy of the Holy See, and all the true Saints whom the Russian Church still invokes as Catholics. In the unexampled ferocities by which "tsarodoxy" is maintained we see only the national policy of Peter I., who still rules Russia, and who avowed that a purely Slavonic religion, of which the Tsar should be the sole lord and supreme interpreter, the only prophet and pontiff, was the instrument by which that policy was to attain its ends. The official Church, fast bound in fetters, might leave truth and virtue to perish throughout the land, and its own ministers be objects of universal contempt, but it must live to be the buttress of tsarodoxy. That was its mission, the only meaning and purpose of its existence. Hence the savage atrocities of Nicholas against all who refused to belong to his political church. Fraud, persecution, inebriety, and unbelief, were venial offences in the submissive agents of Russian policy, but to resist that policy was the one mortal sin in the code of tsarodoxy. Of that crime no Pole was or could be innocent. The hell of Siberia was its punishment. And here we see how inevitably those two anti-Christian allies, schism and nationalism, conspire together against Christian unity and the supreme interests of the human race, against the counsel of God and the liberty of man. They propose to themselves, by the very law of their being, and as the chief aim of their existence, designs and projects which are in direct antagonism with those of God. Even the few Russians in whom a special grace has preserved a certain reverence for the Divine will, and who would gladly make it the rule of their own lives if they could, are carried away by the torrent, and forced to work for ends which deserve the malediction of God. They cannot be faithful to "tsarodoxy" without bidding farewell to truth, justice, and mercy. The partition of Poland was the substitution of brute force for right, and opened that shameful era of greedy nationalism and military empires under which Europe now languishes. For six centuries Poland had been the rampart of Christendom against the Ottoman hosts, and more than eighty times the chivalry of that noble nation had driven back the Tartar, and Mongol hordes, who are now Russians, and are at this day the savage ministers of the

will of the Tsar, as they once were of their own. No nation ever rendered such precious services to the Christian family as Poland, and she displayed the true nobility which the Christian faith begets by more splendid actions. This is her crime in the sight of the barbarous despots who now rule her. Their aim has ever been to impose upon her the sullen and slavery which are essential conditions of their brutal autocracy. They resolved to make of the Catholic Church in Poland and Lithuania the same abject thing which they had made of their own. "It would be easy and has been done a thousand times," says P. Lescour, "to multiply proofs of the complete annihilation, or rather of the absolute subjection of the whole ecclesiastical order, in its relation with the civil authority in Russia. From the pretended holy Synod, which is servile when it is silent and still more servile when it speaks, to the last of the village popes, and the miserable convents of men and women, in which wretched beings languish without piety, fervour, or charity, dismal asylums of ignorance and vice; everywhere will be found the same result produced by the same cause, the subordination, or rather the total effacement of the religious element under the absorbing rule of the civil power." The convents, indeed, are used as prisons, and the P. Gagarin relates in his book, *Le Clerge Russe*, that "when a priest has become guilty of grave faults, and can no longer discharge his functions, he is condemned to a convent, as in other countries people are condemned to the galleys." The official Church of Russia is at once the chief instrument and the chief victim of the savage policy of the Tsars. It is crushed by the despotism to which it strives to reconcile others. In the sixteenth century the monster Ivan—which Nicholas forbade every Russian to call a tyrant—strangled the Patriarch Philip, who reproached him with his excesses, having previously forced his episcopal colleagues to depose him. The same Emperor caused Leonidas, Bishop of Novgorod, to be sewn in the skin of a bear and devoured by dogs, because he had refused to bless a marriage prohibited by the laws of the Eastern Church. In the seventeenth century Peter the Great caused Dositheus, Metropolitan of Rostov, to be broken on the wheel in the public square of Moscow, and poisoned the Metropolitan of Kiev. When he decided to reform the regular clergy of his Empire, he commanded a council to assemble at Moscow, but appointed Baskakoff, the captain of his guards, to preside over its deliberations, and determined the articles of reform. In the eighteenth century, when Catherine, who had forced the synod to proclaim her the "supreme judge" of religion, confiscated all the possessions of the Church, a single Bishop, Arsenius Macielewicz, Metropolitan of Rostov and Jaroslaw, ventured to remonstrate. He was judged by his colleagues, servile instruments of Catherine, condemned as a rebel, degraded, declared to be a layman, and shut up in a fortress, where he died. "When he still attempted to protest, they put an iron gag in his mouth—a striking symbol of the liberty left to the Church of schism!" (7)

Have the Russian bishops acquired more liberty in the nineteenth century than was granted to their enslaved predecessors? An anecdote related by Prince Dolgoroukow furnishes an answer to that question. In the reign of Nicholas, who was in every act of his life as true an Anti-Christ as Ivan or Peter, a dispute arose between Irenous, Archbishop of Irkoutsk, and the civil governor of Eastern Siberia. The latter sent his own report of the matter to St. Petersburg. An aide-de-camp of the Emperor was despatched to Irkoutsk, whose decision was promptly given. Irenous was locked into a carriage, sent five thousand versts to a convent in the province of Volodga, to which he was sentenced to be confined for the rest of his life. "If the Emperor Nicholas," adds the Prince, "consented to admit that our Lord Jesus Christ is the true Head of the Church, all his acts showed that in his opinion the Vicariate belonged to himself alone." If this man savagely persecuted Catholics, whom a wiser policy would have made the most powerful conservative element in the empire, his despotism over his own sect was, if possible, still more cruel. When he raised a bishop to a higher see, he did not permit him to assume the new title "till he had rendered to his august person new services, and given fresh proofs of fidelity." (8) Bishops and Archbishops were liable at any moment to the insults and invectives of this Muscovite Nero, in public, in the presence of the court, and even in church during the celebration of the divine office. He has been seen to strike a priest on the head because something in his demeanour displeased him. Having on one occasion commanded the attendance of an octogenarian prelate, who was prevented by the rigour of winter and the masses of snow from reaching St. Petersburg, Nicholas exiled the aged offender to Siberia. Everything relating to ecclesiastical and spiritual matters in the official church was regulated solely by his command. He fixed the time for the celebration of the Easter communion, declared "valid and legal" the marriage of a pagan with a Mussulman by his own pontifical authority, gave or refused permission to bishops to print their sermons, and prefaced every announcement of the pretended holy synod with the words, "in conformity with the most high will of his majesty." And his example was followed by nobles throughout the country in their dealing with the inferior clergy. "The minister of the altar, the representative of God, is ranked by them with the lowest menials. He is permitted by the more gracious of them to come to their houses on Sunday and get drunk with their servants." If by any chance he should offend them, by any exercise of his sacerdotal function, "he is sent far away from his family to do penance on bread and water in a convent, or even degraded, and delivered in that character to the secular arm, which means for him the knout, the galleys, or Siberia." (9) To reduce the Catholics of the empire, and especially those of Poland, to the same horrible degradation, has been the cherished project of Russian Tsars, and especially of Catherine, Nicholas, and Alexander II. The bare existence of men who preserved a sense of human dignity, and whose noble traditions refused all complicity with the debasing despotism of tsarodoxy, was an offence which these remorseless tyrants could not tolerate. Having bound in fetters their own afflicted Church, the liberty of Catholics was hateful to them. When Count Oubaroff said in the name of Nicholas, as the viceroy of servility, Count Tolstoy, said in that of his successor, "Autocracy, Orthodoxy, Nationality, those are the three ideas which constitute the social basis of the empire," the whole scheme of Russian policy was unfolded. How those ideas were applied by Nicholas, who was as genuine a savage, in spite of his feathers and embroidery, as any Oastik or Samoyed in his dominions, to the ruin and desolation of Poland, we shall see in our next article.—*London Tablet*.

(7) Lescour, t. ii, p. 475.
(8) Lescour, t. ii, p. 476.
(9) *Ibid*, p. 479.

Daniel Purcell, the famous punster, going with a friend to a tavern, found the door shut. He knocked loudly at it, when one of the waiters looked through a little wicket and asked what they would please to have. "Upon the door," said Purcell, "and draw us a pint of wine." The man said, "His master would not allow of it that day, for 'it was a fast day.'" "Hang your master," replied the punster, "is he not content to fast himself, but he must make the doors fast too?"

MISSIONARIES IN SCOTLAND UNDER JAMES THE FIRST.

[From the London Month for December.]

We have before us two letters written by Father Patrick Anderson, S.J., to the Father General of the Society, in the years 1611 and 1620. These will be found interesting as doing in some measure for Scotland what Father Morris's interesting Series has done for the whole of Great Britain, and as bearing witness to the equal courage and fidelity of Scotch Catholics in the maintenance of their faith, and to great triumphs of Divine grace in the conversion of souls. Father Anderson was himself a Scotchman, born in the county of Elgin or Moray. He was the nephew of Dr. John Leslie, Bishop of Ross, who was a faithful adherent of Mary, Queen of Scotland, and her Ambassador at the French Court. After completing his education at the University of Edinburgh, Father Anderson joined the Society of Jesus at Rome in the year 1597, passed through his studies in philosophy and theology with marked success, and became especially noted as a mathematician and linguist. He was selected for the Scotch mission, and after reaching London in November, 1609, proceeded at once to commence his missionary work in his native country. In this he spent the next two years, quitting Scotland for a period towards the close of the year 1611, in obedience to the orders of his Superior, Father James Gordon, of Huntly. This was considered a step of necessary precaution on account of the violent persecution which his zeal and success had stirred up, and the diligent search being made for him on all sides, from which he remarks, he had frequently escaped only by evident miracle. At the time of his departure Father Anderson left only one priest behind him in Scotland, a man already worn out by age and toil; two other secular priests, Andrew Creighton and Roger Lindsay, having been apprehended and sentenced to perpetual banishment in August of the previous year.

While in Rome he was appointed in the year 1615 first Rector of the Scotch College, founded fifteen years before by Pope Clement the Eighth, but he was allowed by his Superiors to return to the scene of his former labours, after he had held this post for five years.

It was upon this second occasion that on St. Patrick's day, the 17th of March, 1620, he was betrayed by a pretended Catholic, Andrew Boyd, for the bribe of £75, into the hands of the magistrates in Edinburgh, by whom he was rigidly confined to the Tolbooth, frequently summoned and examined, and threatened with barbarous tortures. His second letter to Father Mutius Vitelleschi, General of the Society, contains so interesting and graphic an account of this trial that it deserves separate insertion. Whilst in daily expectation of death he was set at liberty, on the petition, it is supposed, of the French Ambassador, the Marquis de la Motte, who chose him for his confessor. After publishing in 1623 a work on *The Ground of the Catholic and Roman Religion in the World of God*, and after preparing, it is said, two other parts in continuation of the same book, as well as a Manual of Devotions for Scotland, he died in London on the 24th of September, 1624, at the age of forty-nine. In the Scotch College at Paris he persevered a work in the handwriting of this Father, *Memoirs of the Scotch Saints*, which he compiled while imprisoned in Edinburgh, and of which he makes mention in his letter dated May 14, 1620.

Father Anderson was, as we have seen, especially qualified to bear witness to the state of the Church in Scotland in the reign of James the First. His missionary excursions extended both over the Highlands and Lowlands, he was conversant with all classes, rich and poor alike, and he was greatly trusted and esteemed by all. He was evidently a man of ability and great learning, of great strength of character, tact, and self-possession; and more than this, he had pre-eminently the virtue, courage and self-devotion of the true missionary, ready and anxious to give up his life at any time for the faith, as we gather from his own expressions, and from the constant fatigue, privation, and perils to which he was exposed.

We can give only a few of the incidents, miraculous cures, and examples of heroic defence of the faith, especially on the part of converts, which Father Anderson narrates in his first letter, and which took place not only amongst the poor and uneducated, but principally amongst the Scotch nobility, showing how large a proportion of noble families in the country were firmly attached to the Catholic religion.

The title of the work with which this Father's name is most connected shows that he had carefully studied the Scriptural argument for the Catholic faith. He evidently used it as one of his chief weapons in attacking the ignorance and prejudices of the Protestant ministers, and in proving points of controversy with those who had the credit of being strong in Bible texts. Even before he reached Scotland he narrates that:

At the house of an English nobleman, where our Father spent a day or two, he entered into a discussion with a certain youth. He was giving abundant proof of various dogmas of the Catholic faith, and observed that the young man was quailing under the force of his arguments. The Father added, "If I do not prove that there exists neither Church nor faith among the English Protestants, and this out of your own Bibles (he used their Bibles only on such occasions,) I will embrace your belief. Let the minister be called; I will propose to him three questions only; and if they do not induce him to silence, I will be yours. The minister came. There were many Catholics present, and all sat down to table. The unskilful minister began the discussion by defending their custom of reading the Bible. He said the Bible was easily to be understood, and contained all articles of faith, and in express terms, as they say. He reiterated that nothing was to be believed beyond the pure and unmixed Word of God. Our Father said a few words calculated to divert suspicion, and then replied, "I do not deny that the Bible is to be read, and read through; but, pray, is it not said to be a dogma of your faith that there are only two sacraments?"

"It is said and believed," replied the minister.

"So far so good, said our friend; but in what part of the Bible do you find this? In what chapter, what verse? Is it from the Old or the New Testament that you make this out?"

To this the minister made no answers, and the Father continued, "From what part of the Bible do you prove that Baptism is a sacrament? And whence do you prove that the Lord's Supper (for so they name it) is a sacrament? Again, it is an article, and a fundamental article of faith, that Christ Jesus is by nature the Son of God, and consubstantial with God the Father. Now tell me, pray, in what part of the Scripture is this asserted in terms?" The minister was confounded, and only replied by silence. The Catholics were delighted, and the heretics were amazed. Our Father continued his discussion upon other articles of our holy faith with the minister, whom he left considerably shaken by this argument, and not ill-disposed towards the Catholic religion. A certain noble widow, also a heretic, was present at the discussion, saw the defeat of the minister, and promised to become reconciled to the Roman Church. I was in a haste to go to Scotland, and thus was unable to remain longer with the minister, although he earnestly begged of me to do so, not to mention the danger which attended my delay in England.

Father Anderson was, as we might have expected, the author of the names of many of those mentioned in his letter. This was more so

successful in precluding identification in that respect than he was in concealing his own share in the incident recorded. The reader must not allow himself to be confused by the constant changes from the first to the third person.

New Perils, as he says, awaited him in Scotland. He knew not where to go or whom to trust. He recommended the matter to God, and, although the frost and cold were increasing, began the journey on foot, and made the acquaintance of certain Catholics. He strengthened his wavering, encouraged those who were fighting boldly, and guided the well-intentioned. Amongst these latter, was one Protestant lady of high rank, who had Scripture at her fingers' ends.

There lived in Edinburgh, the capital of Scotland, a certain noble lady, married to a Catholic nobleman. The latter begged the Father to speak with his wife. The Jesuit and other priests were intimate visitors at his house. Our Father examined the lady's general disposition, but at first with caution. He then spoke to her of the fear of God, from which she conceived no mean opinion of the Father. On the following day he began to speak of the Holy Scriptures, and of the words of Christ, which she had at her fingers' ends. She was a sister in Christ, so the ministers name those who are best versed in the Scriptures, and most tenacious of their opinions. On the third day he spoke of our faith, and of the marks of the Church, quoted from the Protestant Bible. On the seventh day she abjured heresy, made her profession of the Catholic faith, and received the sacraments of the holy Church, to her own great consolation and to the joy of the many Catholics who were present. She remains so constant in the faith as to rival that veteran soldier, her husband.

There was a widow, who was ill, and who was visited by the minister, who offered the usual consolations. She begged him to do one thing for her, to bring her the Communion, as she was in her agony. He refused, saying it was not the custom, and she made a somewhat severe retort. This was the cause of her conversion. She was afterwards happy enough to receive our most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, from which she derives strength to persevere in the faith, desiring to be dissolved and be with Christ, devoted to assiduous prayer and to pious reading.

(TO BE CONTINUED IN OUR NEXT.)

THE HOTEL DIEU HOSPITAL, MONTREAL.

ITS HISTORY—THE FOUNDRESS—AN EXTENSIVE WORK AMONG THE POOR.

The Hotel Dieu is one of the many Roman Catholic charitable institutions in this city of which little is heard or read about, but which quietly and unostentatiously dispense their charities with lavish hand, and none of them are, perhaps, more worthy or more noticed than that of the Hotel Dieu. Few of our readers there are who are unfamiliar with the majestic building, while on the other hand, they remain ignorant of its hundreds of patients, of the orphans and aged inmates succored and cared for, or, in a word, of the bountiful charities distributed by the ladies of this religious sect. Among many Protestants the idea prevails that this institution is strictly a sectarian one, and there are comparatively few, even Roman Catholics, who are conversant with its immense accommodation for patients; medical treatment and the careful as well as scientific nursing gratuitously offered to one and all who require its aid, irrespective of religion, sect, nationality or creed; the only recommendation asked for is that the applicant for entry be really ill and requiring treatment at its hands. The aged find a comfortable home here, while poor orphans are carefully brought up, educated and placed at work by the good Sisters. A brief sketch of this colossal building, as well as a short resume of its

HISTORY SINCE ITS FOUNDATION,

cannot but prove of interest. In 1642 the "Societe de Notre Dame de Montreal," obtained the cession of the Island of Montreal from M. de Luzon, Intendant of the Dauphin of France, and on the 18th of May, in the same year, the few members of the above-named order, along with a Mlle. Mance, a lady belonging to one of the religious societies of France, settled on the island, landing opposite what is now the site of the Royal Insurance building. In 1644 the first Hotel Dieu was founded by Mlle. Mance, being a wooden structure, situated on the north-east side of the Church of Notre Dame. Its dimensions, as may be supposed, were not extensive, consisting of a kitchen, a room for its founder, one for the servants and two rooms for the sick patients. Shortly after its foundation Mlle. Mance contributed \$80,000 towards its funds, under the stipulated conditions, which are rigorously carried out to the present day, that the poor

BE RECEIVED WITHOUT CHARGE.

The hospital, for a long period after its foundation, suffered greatly from the inroads of the Iroquois Indians, many of whom were often kindly sheltered and were cared for within its walls. In 1648 Mlle. Mance visited France for the sole object of replenishing the coffers of her institution, which had reached a very low ebb. Our space will not permit us to enter fully into the details of the many difficulties and hardships endured by this saintly woman in carrying on her good work among the savage Indian tribes of those days; suffice it to say that, subsequently, "Christianity, baptized in blood, was insensibly introduced among them." In 1695 the Society, although very deficient in funds, undertook the construction of another building of three stories 31 by 130 feet, which, within three months of its completion, was burned to the ground with all it contained except the archives. In 1733 it was again rebuilt, and in 1734 a negro set fire to a house close to the river, and the conflagration, spreading from house to house, again laid the Hotel Dieu in ashes. In 1735 the French Government liberally assisted towards its reconstruction, and it was again successfully completed of the same dimension as in 1735. In 1760 the cession of Canada by France to England took place, and during the many battles which occurred previous to this the sick and wounded of both nations were welcomed by the good Sisters of the hospital. Gen. Amherst, commanding the British forces at that time, expressed himself in the following terms in acknowledging the services rendered him by the nurses: "Amherst, grateful to the Sisters for their care of the

WOUNDED ENGLISH SOLDIERS,

sends them a couple of hundred half dollars and two dozen Madera. These are but pledges of the welfare he wishes to a society so respectable as that of the Hotel Dieu, which may rely for the same protection on the part of the British nation which it enjoyed under French domination." From this date the hospital gradually began to expand in dimension and sphere of usefulness. In 1825 it only boasted of 32 beds, while in 1826 the number was augmented to 50, which increased to 180 in 1856. In 1859 the idea was mooted of erecting the hospital in a more favorable position on sanitary grounds; the present site was obtained, and the magnificent building, which is to-day one of Montreal's grandest and most beautiful ornaments, was commenced. Before proceeding further, we may state that from 1810 to 1860, 50,845 men and 30,632 women were admitted and treated gratuitously by the Sisters, and, since 1857, orphans and old

and infirm men and women have been admitted and cared for.

In 1860, the St. Patrick's Hospital being done away with, two wards were provided for English speaking patients, which were placed under the care of Drs. Hingston and Macdonnell.

DESCRIPTION OF THE HOSPITAL.

To give an adequate idea of the internal arrangements would be, not only a very difficult, but also altogether too voluminous an article for our space, and we must therefore confine ourselves to a general description of the institution and its management. The building is divided into two parts by the chapel, the western division being the cloister, and occupied by the Sisters, while the eastern is used as the hospital. On the ground floor are the wash-houses, which in themselves are leviathan departments, containing wash tubs nearly equal in size to the famous wine vats of Heidelberg or Frankfurt. The drying and ironing rooms are also on this floor, and in close proximity to the wash-house. Passing into a long passage, the first door we approach is one of the kitchens, fitted up with all the modern improvements in the culinary line, and containing an immense cooking range. Several Sisters were superintending this department during our visit, and the odor that proceeded from the ovens was of a most tempting nature. Adjoining the kitchen is the larder, with row upon row of shelves, each one laden with tarts, meat pies, jellies, puddings, &c., all of which were for the Sunday dinner of the patients. Next to the larder is found a large store-room, containing all the necessaries for the kitchen, in the most perfect order. The other rooms in the passage are occupied by the servants and washerwomen, as dormitories, dining halls, &c. Passing on the same floor to the west wing, we come to the orphan boys' dining, class and recreation rooms. The little fellows are 63 in number, ranging from six to fourteen years of age. In the pantry some of them are engaged washing up the dishes; others were in the class-room at their studies, while the remainder were enjoying themselves in the recreation room. They were neatly dressed, and appeared to be very happy. In this wing there is another kitchen, equal in size to the one already described; a large fire-proof cellar where the archives, &c., are kept, a paint and carpenter's shop, bakehouse, laundry, laboratory, weaving and knitting and spinning rooms. The bakery in itself is a most extensive establishment, turning out 800 loaves a week. In the laboratory, all the pills, ointments and tinctures, and many of the medicines used in the hospital, are made by the Sisters. On the next floor is found the dispensary, in charge of seven Sisters, all of whom have studied medicine and chemistry. The arrangement of the department is most complete, one section of it being fitted up for the reception of the surgical instruments, which are kept in the most beautiful order. The drug-bottles, phials and ointment-jars bearing the labels, are tastefully printed in letters of gold, all of which is the work of the Sisters. On this floor is the main entrance to the hospital, the registry and receiving rooms, &c. The system of receiving patients is as follows:—At 12 o'clock the visiting physicians arrive, their first duty being to examine all persons desirous of being admitted, and who are shown into the reception-room. Nothing is asked them by the doctors except that pertaining to their disease or infection, and upon the medical gentlemen considering their case sufficiently important to require hospital treatment, the applicant is at once admitted. Subsequently, he is taken to the registry office, where name, age, residence, country, disease and religion are registered and a bed is appointed for his reception in one of the public wards, where all nationalities and sects are placed together. There are six large wards, each one containing 48 beds, and named respectively, St. Patrick's, St. Bridget's, Blessed Virgin, St. Elizabeth, St. Famille and St. Ann's, while there are numerous smaller wards. Private wards are also provided for both sexes, for which a small charge is made, amounting to about \$6 per week. The wards are large, lofty, well-lighted rooms, with a gallery running the full length of the ward on one side. The beds are of iron, provided on each side with neat white curtains. Each ward is attended by three Sisters of Mercy and two lay Sisters. A portion of the second floor is devoted to priests' quarters, containing some twelve rooms for sick clergymen. Two of these rooms are beautifully furnished and set aside for the reception of bishops, and have been occupied by Archbishop Bourget, Bishop Tracadry, of New Brunswick, Mgr. Fabre, and others. On the same floor as the priests' rooms are found the female orphans' department, numbering some 48. The Sisters are 84 in number, their duties being divided amongst the offices or departments. The following are the statistics of the hospital for last year:—Total patients, 2,360; Catholics, 2,325; Protestants, 35; of which 1,216 were males, and 1,144 were females; deaths, 64 males and 49 females. The expenses of the hospital per day averaged about \$350, and the expenses of the cloister and the hospital together about \$350. The revenue, which is derived from rental of warehouses on St. Paul and St. Sulpice streets, as well as from seigniorial rights and donations, has, until lately, been sufficient to meet the expenditure, but last year, owing to a number of the warehouses being under the Sisters have found it necessary to obtain a loan. Their revenue is entirely obtained from the above mentioned sources, as they do not receive any subsidy from Government.—*Montreal Star*.

A Career for Catholic Young Men.

There is no denying that the mass of Catholic young men fall to appreciate their vocation. After their First Communion, very many of them neglect their religious duties one after another, with the necessarily damaging result of a life dragged out under the shadow of God's curse. Here one becomes known as a blasphemous drunkard, another passes down step by step, into a threnard's grave. This one suffers the mental and bodily blight wrought by impure excesses. That one loses his piety first and then his faith. On them the knowledge of God's Revelation, the grace of baptism, and the whole supernatural life for which the martyrs were willing to give even their blood are lost. This is a solemn fact, attested by nearly every pastor's experience.

Now, what do these recreant Catholics get in exchange for the graces they squander? Darkness of understanding, remorse of conscience, and the contempt of the world that they thus foolishly saw upon abandoning the practice of their faith.— They lived in the King's palace, had the Son of God for their brother.—Mary for their mother.—Angels for their companions.—God for their inheritance. Neglecting their religious duties, "becoming as the horse and the mule without understanding," they abandon their proud and secure position, and enter into competition with those who are "without hope and without God, in the world." Nero, the Emperor of the world, earned the contempt of history, because he had the ambition to compete with the horse jockeys. Every Christian youth will earn the contempt of the world, his own self-reproach, and the scorn of the very demons themselves, by preferring the goods of faith to the delusions of sense. The career for Catholic young men is to be Catholics. Life is short. Eternity is all that is worth striving at. Eternity will unravel mysteries, satisfy longings, cool heart-burnings, pay for sufferings, refute calumnies, and justify all wrongs, and bring perfect and enduring peace.—*Pittsburg Catholic*.

(1) Thackeray's *Journal from Corinth to Grand Cairo* ch. xiii.
(2) *Essay on Frederic the Great*.
(3) Lescour, t. ii, p. 388.
(4) *Le Polone Contemporain*, par O. de Mazade, ch. III, p. 95.
(5) Lescour, t. ii, p. 381.
(6) *Ibid*.
(7) *Ibid*.