

separate. This is clearly and surely a matter of conscience, and liberty of conscience is here involved, and is denied the Catholic citizen.

Moreover, on the part of at least one non-Catholic body, this attitude is self-contradictory. The charge that the Church clashes with the laws of the State redounds upon its own self. Its own canons forbid what the State allows in marriage, and declare invalid what the State declares valid, and that in two distinct cases, viz. the re-marriage of divorced persons, and the marriage of a man with his deceased wife's sister. The argument *ad hominem* is pardonable in this instance. I think, because it is relevant and direct.

Far be from me to impugn the motives of men whom we know to be just, well-meaning, and filled with zeal for the cause of good. But zeal may be mistaken and misguided, and in the present question we contend that it is. What would be the ultimate gain from State interference and change? Is it anticipated that Catholics will admit upon dictation from the State that valid marriages are invalid, or invalid marriages are valid? Will Catholics be expected to comply in conscience with a law that affirms as true what their conscience tells them is false, or proclaim the invalidity of what their conscience attests is valid? Not any more than Catholics will comply with a law that forbids hearing Mass