

The Catholic Record.

"Christianus mihi nomen est, Catholicus vero Cognomen."—(Christian is my Name, but Catholic my Surname.)—St. Paclan, 4th Century.

VOLUME XXVI.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, JUNE 25, 1904

1340

The Catholic Record.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 25, 1904.

PAPAL DIPLOMACY.

The Montreal Daily Witness had a preachment a short time ago on Papal Diplomacy. The editor does not seem to know the name of the present occupant of the Vatican, but he refers, we presume, to Pius X. He regrets—and he puts it very nicely—the recent protest against M. Loubet's visit. That friction could have been avoided is clear to him. Pius X. and the Cardinal Secretary of State lack astuteness, and the Papacy pays for it by a loss of prestige among the nations of Europe. Were the Pope a diplomat of the elusive type he might have ignored the visit of M. Loubet to the Quirinal—a visit which was intentionally sought for by the Italian Government with a view thereby to weaken the rights of the Holy See.

But because he is a judge and guardian of the rights of Catholics the world over he protests against this deliberate insult. It seems to us that the editor should consider the protest to be in the interests of civilization. Napoleon III. indeed endeavored to make successful brigandage a principle of International Law, but no diplomacy could put this in harmony with justice.

This action, then, of Pius X. in defence of principle, and in arraignment of robbery and usurpation should be lauded by the reasonable. That an old man poor in the resources in which the world takes pride should put himself forward as the uncompromising upholder of the moral law should be commended without reserve.

The editor refers to the impossible position created by Pius IX. in refusing to recognize the established fact of the Italian monarchy.

How and why it is impossible he does not state. At any rate he but echoes the sentiments of those who applauded and abetted the brigands who insulted and outraged and robbed Pius IX., and because he refused to condone theft and usurpation, and to welcome a Government, which, as Crispi declared at Berlin, would soon relegate the Catholic Church to the hell of Dante, he was dubbed a reactionary. Pius IX., as his successor today, invited to give up to the usurpers as their freehold property the provinces arrested from the Pontifical States. Here is his answer: This daring and unheard of proposition simply means that the Apostolic See, which has always been, and shall ever continue to be the bulwark of truth and justice, ought to sanction this principle that a thing taken perforce from its owner may be peacefully retained by the unjust aggressor: it means also a sanction of this erroneous maxim that a triumphant wrong is not an infraction of the sacredness of right.

Hence it follows that the Pontiff can in no wise consent to the spoliation wrought by these Vandals without shaking to its foundations the moral law of which he is acknowledged to be the form and the image.

THE POPE THE DEFENDER OF TRUTH AND JUSTICE.

The editor also informs his readers that if the Pope's gift of government had been as good as his heart he could have done much to bring about a better state of things.

This pronouncement is, in view of the facts, rather amusing. One thing that escapes the notice of the editor is that M. Loubet, by ignoring the rule regarding the visits of the chiefs of Catholic states to Rome, extorted a protest from the Pope. Could he have acted otherwise with honor? Another thing for the editor to consider is that courage in renegeing an injury is no proof of a lack of executive ability, and he may also remember that not all the French secular papers denounce the Vatican for the protest. Furthermore, it is not at all certain that the Papacy has lost ground by this episode. But even were that the case, the glory of Pius X. as a defender of truth and justice would not be diminished.

THE CHURCH AND M. COMBES.

It is the fashion with some writers to contend that M. Combes is not warring against the Church. The religious orders only are attacked because they are disloyal to the Republic. These writers are ignorant as to what is a religious order, its origin and its standing in the Church. Then again for proofs of disloyalty they rely on the words of the atheists, or of that kind of Christian who believes in using any

weapons against institutions connected with the Church. The fact is, however, that M. Combes is devoting his energies to destroy religion altogether. He and his satellites leave no doubt as to this. Gambetta's, watchword: "Le clericalisme c'est l'ennemi" is on their lips. The fight in France is between atheism and the Church. And some good folk have been invited to become allies of the atheist. We do not know if they have contributed to his support; but we are not blind to the fact that one Canadian paper published without comment an account of the French Government's policy which was at variance with the truth, and hypocritical enough to make it distasteful to any fair minded human being.

THE CONCORDAT OF 1801.

The Church Made a Servant of the State.

THE AMERICAN SYSTEM—SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE THE MODICUM ACCEPTABLE TO A REPUBLICAN REGIME.

The most casual reader of newspapers or magazines knows of the sweeping policy the French Government has adopted in regard to the religious orders, now nearly all suppressed in France. He must also be aware that the relations between Church and State have become ominously strained in a country once called "the most Christian kingdom," the ruler of which was named "the oldest son of the Church," but where long since the anti-religious spirit has wrought great evils. We would seem, however, to ignore the power of Christian faith, of Christian ideals, also to underestimate their influence—still very great in France, were we to draw from the present state of affairs the inference that Catholicism is doomed—as some will have it—in the land of St. Bernard, of Bossuet and of Lacordaire. True, if the fate of the Church there were dependent on and riveted to the maintenance of the "Concordat" of 1801, her future would look decidedly unpromising. It is asserted, indeed, in seemingly well-informed quarters, that the days of said Concordat are numbered. Such a statement may be a rash one; but whether it is or not, it is far from sure that the abrogation of the Concordat would really sound the death knell of Catholicism in France.

THE CONCORDAT.

When that famous agreement between the First Consul Bonaparte and Pius VII. was signed in 1801, and put in force the year after, it was considered a very happy move by both contracting parties, and the beginning of an auspicious alliance for them. Bonaparte, indeed, wanted the clergy to help him in his general policy and in his personal designs. The Supreme Pontiff, on the other hand, was most gratified to have the Church and the State wedded once again. For it is one of the principal dogmas of the Church, an essential tenet of Catholic orthodoxy, in a normal condition of things, that the State ought to make open profession of Christian faith; that a divorce between the temporal and the spiritual domain is a downright and dangerous heresy. Catholicism—we believe—is wonderfully logical in upholding that doctrine. But for all that, it still remains an open question whether, for the interest of religion and of the Church, that particular agreement of 1801 was the best one that could be imagined, or whether it was not exposing again both religion and Church, to the old, inveterate and irreconcilable animosity of a large body of the people, and, in addition, since it calls itself, and is considered abroad, the intellectual elite of the nation. The reader to whom French affairs and history are not quite familiar, may not know that the rapprochement brought about by the Concordat was intensely resented by the middle class (*Bourgeoisie*) in Paris; so much so that the four political assemblies then in existence, though dreading Bonaparte's enmity and spirit of revenge, plainly manifested their ill-humor and displayed their anger when called upon to discuss the Concordat. The legislative body, the Senate, the Tribunal, the Council of State made it clear to Bonaparte that his Concordat was to them as annoying as anything could be. In fact, the treaty would never have been voted by these assemblies if Bonaparte had not made a second *coup d'Etat*, by renegeing the Legislature and the Tribunal and filling these bodies with men of his own personal choice. And even then the First Consul felt obliged to placate public opinion. That is why, *pro tempore*, he published the *proclamation* (as the object of the Concordat itself was termed) he added to the treaty seventy-seven articles called "Organic articles of the Catholic cult." These articles were decreed without the least assent, even knowledge of the Pope, and deliberately put the Church, body and soul, at the mercy of the French Government. "Religion became a department of the Government, a subject of administration," Count Portalis, who endeavored, in a memorable speech, to justify the Concordat before the Legislature, was accused of having turned "Almighty God into a French functionary." In point of fact, that was exactly how Bonaparte looked at religion. "My gendarmes"—said he—"my priests and my prefects have to attend to the peace and order of my empire." Discipline, doctrine and dogma were placed under State control, as will be shown later on. It is interesting to note that quite a few

Cardinals were not at all agreeable to that Concordat, some even offered strenuous resistance to Pius VII. The Holy Father, however, persisted and in the Brief *Ton Altius*, as well as in the Bull *Ecclesie Dei*, he gave the motives of his actions. The sainted Pontiff was actuated, assuredly, by the noblest impulses, by the loftiest reasons. Maybe that if he had known of the "Organic articles," soon to be published he would have kept back his acquiescence and refused his co-operation. Possibly the reader will inquire what, in case the Concordat had not been enacted and enforced, would have been the fate of the Church? The answer is easy enough to give. The Church would have fared then and henceforward in France, as it fares to-day in England and America. This can be demonstrated briefly. Yet, first let us recapitulate what had taken place in Paris in regard to religious matters between the years 1789 and 1801.

The "Constituante" (assembly called upon to make a new Constitution, 1789-1791), fearful of its principles had presumed to organize the Catholic clergy, and, indeed had decreed "the civil constitution of the clergy." The majority of the clergy refused to submit to the preposterous scheme and endured, for the sake of their faith, every kind of persecution. The Church was at that time completely disorganized. The "Convention" (1792-1795) in which the Jacobins were all-powerful, thought that some sort of worship should be maintained. One party, therefore, proclaimed the cult of the "Goddess Reason." So Notre Dame and twenty-five hundred churches in France, were transformed into temples of Reason—i.e., of Atheism. Another party afterwards, that of Robespierre, put down the Goddess Reason and proclaimed the cult of the Supreme Being. That period, called very properly the "Carnival of Irreligion," lasted from November 1793 to July 1794. The terrible had its day. The "reaction" of 1795, the "middle class," taking courage again, in their turn sent the Jacobins to the guillotine and accomplished the reaction, called of Thermidor (July). They proclaimed the neutrality of the State in matters of religion. Indeed people had experienced more than enough that the interference of the State in ecclesiastical questions is, and ever must be, grotesque, absurd and intolerable. Consequently, from Sept. 18, 1794, to April 18, 1802, France lived for eight years under the regime of separation of Church and State, the Government having decreed the complete liberty of worship and made known its firm intention of subsidizing no clergy. That last clause was, undoubtedly, a downright injustice to the Catholic Church, since all her estates had been robbed from her and sold under the revolutionary regime. It is very probable that the penalty of the French clergy was one of the reasons which determined Pius VII. to accept the overtures of the First Consul with a view to a mutual understanding and support. But, save for that aspect of the question, save also for the national establishment of religion, it is very easy to explain how and why the Concordat has damaged at once the Church and the cause of religion in France. For the Concordat, in France, was far from being a demonstration, we make bold to say and to prove that the manner in which Church and State have been united in France for the last five centuries has been for the Church, for the Papacy especially, but a long series of humiliations endured for the fear of worse evils, and for religion a cause of revilement and hatred. Why then the clergy, the secular and the regular, with a few notable exceptions today, have been all along displaying in France their sympathies for the monarchical regime, is an inscrutable mystery, and not for us alone, but for all Catholics abroad who ask angrily what right a part of the French clergy has to denounce the Union of Church and religion for the sake of a policy which all people that experience has sobered, denounce as a folly.

We shall do our best to be brief and clear, though the subject is essentially an intricate and a long one. But facts will speak for themselves and will enable us to show how the union between Church and State in the old regime and in the nineteenth century has wrought two great evils in France: firstly, in depriving the Church of every bit of its independence and self-government; secondly, in forcing upon the French hierarchy a policy which estranged it from the Papacy. Perhaps, also, will this paper explain the puzzling fact that France, though a Catholic power, though foremost in the world of Catholic piety at home and Catholic missions abroad, has been, more than any other nation, a dangerous foe to the Papacy, as well as the most disintegrating force, dissolving agent of faith and religion.

King vs. Pope. Scarcely had the long strife between the holy Roman Empire and the Papacy (1073-1273) been brought to a standstill, when it began between the King of France and the Pope. The reasons of the struggle were just the same, to wit, the rights and privileges vindicated by the crown as against those claimed by the Supreme Pontiff. Not that the Papacy denied the right of the State, but the "temporal sword"—said the Popes—must be swayed for the service and at the injunction of the spiritual power, *pro ecclesia et ad nutum ecclesie*. The kings of France, on the contrary, were bent on using and extending their rights in favor of their own ambition and at the cost of the Papal and ecclesiastical prerogatives. The

shrewd, unscrupulous and haughty despots who reigned on the banks of the Seine were determined not to yield a hair-breadth of their rights, and only began the contest when their authority at home was sufficiently well-established, in order not to be hampered, like the German Emperors had been, by internal dissensions. Then began the long succession of merciless vexations and humiliations, which in the course of five centuries (1303-1809) the rulers of France—Philip the Fair, Louis XIV. and Napoleon I. foremost of all—inflicted on a helpless Papacy, on Pious Boniface VIII., Innocent XI. and Pius VII., quite especially. At the same time, reviving the old Roman law, the kings' jurists made use of that code of the Roman Emperors, to renege what they called the encroachments of the Church, and help to establish an absolute monarchy on the basis of a national and civil legislation. Such was the origin of what has been named the *regal Gallicanism*, i.e., of a spirit of independence which found its expression in measures enacted to repress the interference of the Papacy in all French affairs, either political or religious. For five centuries that relentless aggression went on, undermining steadily the prestige and the authority of the Pope.

Though had enough so far, the policy of the French kings had another feature worse still. As may readily be anticipated, a power driving at unrestrained absolutism would never rest until it had secured a dominating influence over the hierarchy and the Church. To that intent nothing could be more helpful than what we have to mention now, as the *Episcopal Gallicanism*, or the policy by which the French episcopate shook off, as much as it could, the useful, necessary and wholesome control of the Papacy. How was that made possible? How did that spirit of independence from the Roman Pontiff originate among the French Bishops? Two circumstances are accountable for that: The sad state of the Papacy in the fifteenth century, on the one hand; the diplomatic skill of two kings on the other. Charles VII. amid the dreadful confusion of the Western Schism (1378-1449) and of the rivalry of two Popes, summoned a synod in Bourges (1438) and had the Bishops and the laymen enact the *Pragmatic Sanction*, which certain French historians call the "first monument of our Gallican liberties." It was nothing less than the noxious doctrines of the Council of Bale, viz., that the general council is superior to the Pope; that the Pope must summon such a council every ten years; that the Universal Church alone is infallible, etc., etc. Such doctrines, utterly irreconcilable with the unity of the Church and the magistracy of the Supreme Pontiff, the latter could never sanction. Henceforth the Popes had no rest until the total nullification of the Pragmatic Sanction. That was brought about eighty years later, by the Concordat of Bologna (1516), agreed between Pope Leo X. and King Francis I., just at the very eve of the Protestant revolution in Europe. There is little doubt that said Concordat saved the kingdom of France from becoming Protestant. But, alas! what a high price the Pope paid for obtaining the eradication of doctrines so antagonistic to and subversive of the papal rights and of true Catholicism. Francis I. acquiesced in cancelling the Pragmatic of Bourges solely on the condition that Leo would grant to the kings of France the right for all times of selecting clerics to all the ecclesiastical offices and dignities, and would keep to himself but the right of confirmation. An immense patronage was thereby granted to the French rulers, who henceforward had in their gift an endless number of rich and fruitful livings, prebends and benefices of all kinds. In point of fact, the humiliation of a "episcopal Gallicanism" was made in Bologna the object of a bargain which simply delivered up the French clergy to the French monarchs. Truly it mattered very little in those days, whether the Papal Bull confirming a Bishop had *nominavit* alone, or *nominavit nobis*, since the haughty, disdainful and brutal King Francis I. suffered no contradiction whatever, so long they were omnipotent. Perhaps it is well to note, here, for the edification of such clerics in France as go on bewailing the monarchical regime, that the French kings have shown themselves more intolerant and more overbearing than any other relations in the world can ever be in its strikingly obvious that by such a system the monarchy has, unintentionally, yet decidedly injured the Church and the Catholic religion. Or was, peradventure, a system that made of the king the fountain of Church dignities and honors well adapted to make the clergy respected and religion revered? When the man in the street, when the people at large saw the clergy always obliged to side with the Government, render itself, so to say, the accomplice of his policy in home affairs or against the Holy Father, that could their impressions be! Did it not suggest the notion of a national Church, wholly independent of the Papacy? It also gave ground to the belief that the hierarchy favored the despotism of the monarch? That the Church was responsible in some way, for the dreadful condition the country was in? Furthermore was it not apparent that under such a lamentable system the nobility was simply monopolizing the higher dignities and the wealth of the Church, much to the damage of the faithful and of religion? Verily, if the

Roman Pontiff had been allowed to exert greater influence in the selection of Church dignitaries in France, never would the French hierarchy have given to the world the sad spectacle it gave all along the eighteenth century.

In the nineteenth, since the Revolution has changed so many things in France, the sons of the nobility never thought again of entering the hierarchy. They have left the priesthood to the sons of the peasantry for whom it is also a kind of social promotion. Since then, let it be said and emphasized, there never has been in France a priesthood more active and pious, a hierarchy more admirable for its virtues, its sanctity and for its disinterested devotion to a noble and beautiful task. The monarchical regime was again harmful to the Church in another way. King Louis XIV., assuming that he was the principal champion of orthodox doctrine and religious opinion, endeavored to protect both by measures of his own devising. The Protestants were endangering the Catholic unity. The process of converting them by controversy and persuasion was progressing, it is true, but rather slowly. The revocation of the Edict of Nantes, openly blamed by the Pope, but enforced by the king, re-established order in the realm. So two hundred thousand French families preferred to leave their country than to forsake their faith! Between the *Jansenists* and the Jesuits it was again the king who decided. Beneath the subtlety of theological disputes, Louis XIV. discovered in Jansenism a sect which, through an exaggerated individualism would lead in religion to Protestantism, and in politics to the representative system. It was not enough for the king that Rome had condemned the scholars and theologians of Port Royal; he expelled them, he cast to the winds the people of that once famous establishment; he levelled to the ground the house of Port Royal des Champs. Then under Louis XV. came the turn of the *Jesuits*. The courts condemned them, confiscated their property and banished these staunch defenders of the pontifical power. The king, believing them guilty, forsook them, nay, had them expelled from all the countries where the house of Bourbon was reigning. Pope Clement XIV. himself was compelled to yield to the imperious requests of three kings, to disband and suppress the society. The room left empty in France by the expulsion of so many different people, all victims of their religious faith, was thereafter occupied by the heralds of unbelief, of atheism and materialism. Behold the spectacle: Royal orthodoxy, coupled, as is known, with the most appalling looseness of morals ever seen in a Christian court, in the very age of Bossuet, Fenelon and Bourdaloue, expelling on the one hand such people as are everywhere, for their character and morality, the honor of a nation, and on the other, compelling a sainted Pope to surrender to its dictates; a scandalous lesson of impiety given to a nation! Is that a regime which, in any country under the sun, ought to bewail and regret? This is not all, either. There is something more to add to the gloomy picture of the relations of Church and State under the French monarchy.

Since we have had to recall the sorrowful failure, in regard to Catholic interest, of the period which is called in France the *Restoration*—we might name it the "monarchical reconstruction"—it is as well to finish the story and to say that the same untoward course was followed again under the second empire, but then with consequences still more disastrous for Church and religion. Indeed, not only did the clergy have to share the discredit and disfigurement that befell the regime which they helped to establish, but they could readily hold themselves foremost responsible for a system which was to be instrumental in destroying the temporal power of the Papacy. Said Mgr. de Salinis, Bishop of Amiens, in a memorable charge to his people: "When the Church meets Caesar, her duty is to go to him and offer him not only peace but her alliance. We are decided to lend the Emperor our most loyal help and we pledge ourselves to aid him in the accomplishment of the providential mission assigned to him." Alas! the Papacy soon experienced what that mission meant for her and for the Church!

It will remain the eternal honor of our great Lacordaire to have foreseen what would be the outcome of that policy of the hierarchy in France. It grieved and disheartened him more than can be described. He had expected something very different. He wrote: "The people have had the divine intuition of the natural alliance between Catholicism and liberty." He was precisely that alliance which Montalembert and others (all laymen and French) had emphasized and expounded on all occasions, and especially in their gazette, *Le Libérateur*. Said the great orator: "Let us give to the Catholics the taste of liberty; let us persuade them to give up the protection of the State, its favors and privileges and to depend no more but on themselves." True, the government of Louis Philippe had given cause enough to the clergy to make them long for their independence. But it was "love's labor lost." Napoleon III. had but to appear and all the exertions of Montalembert, Lacordaire, etc., were frustrated. It is hard, perhaps, to give up a system that has lasted now for a thousand years, and to sever forever the Church from the State. In the eyes of the best minds, in France, it is now the only way for Church and religion to keep in touch with the age. The liberal wing of the French nobility begin to understand it, at last! In a memorable sitting of the French Academy, on March 10, 1868, Count d'Haussonville, answering the speech of the new member, the very distinguished Count de Mun, said: "As for that conception itself, in regard to the close alliance between the Church and the State, whether it be a monarchy or any other form of government, I shall certainly astonish you, but I am bound to say that I never desired it. I shall never desire it!" Facing such an audience and so many representatives of the more conservative part of his own class, the noble academicien was doubtless quite courageous, even fifty years after Montalembert had said just the same thing.

If Catholicism, if Church and religion are to make up for all the time lost, it

proved severely for having suggested

the repeal of the "Organic Articles." When Leo XII. informed the world of the coming jubilee (1825) the French Government would not let the Papal Bull be published in France until the Council of State had examined and approved its contents. Louis XVIII. and Charles X. were, to be sure, more respectful of religion than their predecessors, but like them they believed that the Church must be made subordinate to the State.

Two men of remarkable talents, both French, *De Maistre* and *Lamennais*, endeavored, at that time, to tell the world that there is no Catholicism, no Church, if the Pope's authority is not supreme over both. The Gallican doctrine was confuted decisively, by De Maistre in regard to the religious power, by Lamennais in regard to the political one; both showing that neither the episcopate, nor still less the civil power had a right to share or curtail the pontifical authority.

The Government resented that intrusive interference with its rights. Lamennais was sued in court and condemned for having attacked the Declaration of 1682 and offended the religion of the State (April, 1826).

On the hierarchy the teachings of both writers were lost. The seminaries went on inculcating in the minds of their students the pure Gallican doctrine, and the idea that the Church of France enjoyed an autonomy of its own. The French hierarchy were blind; they did not see that an era of liberty had dawned on the world and that the Church could make the most of it for its own spiritual interests, progress and independence. Instead of that, their hearts, full of the Bourbons, would rather break than disrupt that mystical union in which they confounded the interests of the Church and those of the throne. And when the throne of these Bourbons was, a second time, swept away, in 1830, in a storm of anger and revenge, again the Church had to take her share of that immense unpopularity, and again religion was made to pay for the mistaken policy of its ministers. Never were so many editions of Voltaire and Rousseau published as between 1821 and 1830. Scepticism was once more making lamentable inroads in the educated middle class, and even in the nobility. In 1830, the Easter communions in Paris were much less numerous than ever before, even before even under the empire. It was a source of unspeakable joy for the Voltairians.

Since we have had to recall the sorrowful failure, in regard to Catholic interest, of the period which is called in France the *Restoration*—we might name it the "monarchical reconstruction"—it is as well to finish the story and to say that the same untoward course was followed again under the second empire, but then with consequences still more disastrous for Church and religion. Indeed, not only did the clergy have to share the discredit and disfigurement that befell the regime which they helped to establish, but they could readily hold themselves foremost responsible for a system which was to be instrumental in destroying the temporal power of the Papacy. Said Mgr. de Salinis, Bishop of Amiens, in a memorable charge to his people: "When the Church meets Caesar, her duty is to go to him and offer him not only peace but her alliance. We are decided to lend the Emperor our most loyal help and we pledge ourselves to aid him in the accomplishment of the providential mission assigned to him." Alas! the Papacy soon experienced what that mission meant for her and for the Church!

It will remain the eternal honor of our great Lacordaire to have foreseen what would be the outcome of that policy of the hierarchy in France. It grieved and disheartened him more than can be described. He had expected something very different. He wrote: "The people have had the divine intuition of the natural alliance between Catholicism and liberty." He was precisely that alliance which Montalembert and others (all laymen and French) had emphasized and expounded on all occasions, and especially in their gazette, *Le Libérateur*. Said the great orator: "Let us give to the Catholics the taste of liberty; let us persuade them to give up the protection of the State, its favors and privileges and to depend no more but on themselves." True, the government of Louis Philippe had given cause enough to the clergy to make them long for their independence. But it was "love's labor lost." Napoleon III. had but to appear and all the exertions of Montalembert, Lacordaire, etc., were frustrated. It is hard, perhaps, to give up a system that has lasted now for a thousand years, and to sever forever the Church from the State. In the eyes of the best minds, in France, it is now the only way for Church and religion to keep in touch with the age. The liberal wing of the French nobility begin to understand it, at last! In a memorable sitting of the French Academy, on March 10, 1868, Count d'Haussonville, answering the speech of the new member, the very distinguished Count de Mun, said: "As for that conception itself, in regard to the close alliance between the Church and the State, whether it be a monarchy or any other form of government, I shall certainly astonish you, but I am bound to say that I never desired it. I shall never desire it!" Facing such an audience and so many representatives of the more conservative part of his own class, the noble academicien was doubtless quite courageous, even fifty years after Montalembert had said just the same thing.

If Catholicism, if Church and religion are to make up for all the time lost, it

proved severely for having suggested

CONTINUED ON PAGE FIVE.