

THE BUSINESS SIDE OF RELIGION.

By Rev. J. T. Roche, LL. D., in Philadelphia Catholic Standard and Times.

THOSE WHOSE RELIGION COSTS THEM NOTHING.

It is not a question here of the poor, of those who are not able to pay. From these the Church asks and expects nothing. It is a question of those who are able to pay and who will not. Let there be no mixing of words and no misunderstandings. Vague words and gentle hints in a case of this kind are worse than useless. They elicit nothing but faint smiles from those for whom they are chiefly intended. Pastors have sinned through excessive gentleness, and these people have come to believe that they can pursue their course with impunity. If the shoe pinches, we want it to pinch so good, and hard that its effects will be felt in the collection box next Sunday, and on other Sunday throughout the year. We have all been in the habit of treating those people too gingerly. We credit them with feelings which they do not possess. The real truth is that they are destitute of shame; they are devoid of self-respect. The plainest kind of plain talk is what they need, and nothing else will do.

Again, let there be no misunderstandings. I am treating of people who still claim to be Catholics, who frequent Catholic churches, at least from time to time, who approach the sacraments at more or less irregular intervals, who do not hesitate to call for a priest in case of serious illness, who cherish the hope of dying in the state of grace and of being buried with the last rites of the Church. They worship in edifices toward the construction of which they have contributed little or nothing. They hear the Mass of the priest whom others support. They enjoy all the facilities of divine worship which others pay and they do this year after year because there are enough of generous people to bear the burdens which they should share, and because the traditional charity of the priesthood hesitates about publicly exposing the shortcomings of any particular class of sinners.

FLAUNTER STILL. The following extract from a letter received within the past few days from a well known pastor in the city of Buffalo, N. Y., is very much to the point: "Don't mince words in the treatment of your subject. We are on a tightrope. I have people attending my Church the color of whose money I have never seen. I have people occupying pews for the use of which I have never received a dollar. I have people coming to Mass Sunday after Sunday, and crowding the good pews out of their pews. They simply will not do their duty in the matter of contributing, and warnings and admonitions seem to be a mere waste of words. They have no shame, no sense of justice or honor. I was going to add no religion, but I will not presume to judge in so weighty a matter. Every parish in the country has pastors everywhere, are people, and they are the problem of how to bring them to time. I believe there is one way. Force them out into the light. Focus public opinion upon them and the problem is already half solved."

ALWAYS A PRETEXT. When approached as to their reasons for not contributing, these people are always found to have a pretext. The commonest pretext is that they are dissatisfied with the management of the parish. It is an ancient and a venerable one, and even in the days of the Prophet Jeremiah it was suffering seriously from overwork. Perhaps the pastor has been imprudent enough to contract a debt without their advice or permission, or it may be that he has erected a building which is unnecessary judgment, or that he has been too frank in his money talks, and has in this way offended their sensibilities, which are generally very acute. Then there is the old plea of that much-talked about early Christian Ananias, and his close-fisted wife, Sapphira. It is the plea of pretended poverty. The tragedy of that historic couple seems to have deterred many from making similar pleas. These people like nothing better than a frequent change of pastors. The man who remains for any length of time in charge of a parish is their natural enemy. He knows them, and that is enough. They are generally, however, the first on the ground to welcome a new pastor, and their sympathy are of a nature to deceive the young and inexperienced. They have met them before, and they recognize them almost immediately. They are very suspicious, too, of the critics of former administrations. They know that the old guard, the tried and trusted friends of former pastors, can always be depended upon to do the right thing. They accordingly listen to wait for whatever the future may unfold. They know, too, that the critics and "knockers" of a congregation are largely recruited from this class, and that their grievances are, in nine cases out of ten, financial ones. They could be really sweet and agreeable Christians, if they were not expected to pay.

THE SILENT THING IN CONNECTION WITH this whole matter concerns the children. It is a well established fact that many of them fall away from the Church. It could not well be otherwise. From the beginning they are, in a certain sense, religious outcasts. They soon come to understand the anomalous position of their parents, and have no feeling upon things which they feel keenly many things which they are taught to believe that the Church is a mercenary institution, and that priests are also greedy to much interested in the financial side of their sacred calling. They become gradually embittered against both Church and priest, and the final step of separation is easily taken.

POOR PARISHES. I read an article in a Boston paper not long ago treating of a Protestant congregation at Plymouth, Mass., in which it was stated that the people neither attended Church nor gave to its support, and that, as a consequence, they had a new preacher every year. The retiring pastor always gave up in disgust, and his successor became suddenly unpopular as soon as he began to demand his promised salary.

If Catholic pastors could pack up and leave every time their salary was not forthcoming, there would be many vacant parishes everywhere throughout the land. Many of them undergo positive privations and suffer on in silence rather than appeal to men and women who, they know by bitter experience, will receive their appeal with studied indifference.

There are a few "poor parishes" in every diocese. They have not been termed "poor" by reason of the poverty of the parishioners. They are poor because the people have never acquired the habit of giving generously and freely. Appointment to them is regarded in the light of an exile, which some priests must undergo for a time in order that they may better appreciate decent parishes when the terms of their probation have expired.

There are grave and prudent priests who hold that one of the best ways of making a poor pay a good Catholic is to make him pay. The mere fact of his having paid creates a desire to get his money's worth, even in matters of religion. The real reason, however, for the change of heart which is thus frequently noted lies in the added sense of self respect and in consciousness that he is at last doing his duty. He is no longer an intruder. He meets and mingles with his religious brethren on terms of equality. He can now employ, without compunction, the collective term "we" in speaking of church affairs, and he feels that at last he really belongs to the household of the faith.

The religion, too, which costs nothing generally costs a good deal in things which cannot be measured by a mere monetary standard. The loss of reputation, friends, self-respect, honor in a community are considerations which always have had weight with the best element of humanity. They cannot be overlooked even by those who make the acquisition of the world's goods the chief aim and purpose of their existence. The heaviest cost of all is that which comes last. It is the loss of eternal happiness and the blessedness of heaven, which is the penalty imposed upon those who disregard the commandments. And lest it be forgotten, let us repeat: There is a commandment bearing upon contributing to the support of religion.

SOCIALISM. That socialism is "in the air" will be admitted by many who give the subject consideration. Novels are written, the primary by 2 of which is to spread socialism. Attractive dramas of the day are presented to give wide popularity to the doctrines of socialism. Newspapers and pamphlets are multiplied to disseminate its principles and teachings. The "man in the street" and the "man in the shop" are influenced by various means to become the votaries of socialism. The upholders of socialism make contrasts and seek to engender hatred between people of different positions in life with the purpose of spreading discontent. When an appeal is made to law, the cry is raised: "The laws have been made by the rich for the protection of the rich."

Cardinal Manning was accustomed to say that the time in which he lived was signalized by the revolt of the intellect against divine revelation and the teachings of the Church, and the revolt of the working classes against lawful, constituted authority and the compulsion of labor necessitated by the very conditions of civilized society.

These questions are as pressing now as they were in the nineteenth century, and to many the outlook is even more disturbed. We must remember that the teachings of Christ insist that this world is our permanent home, and that that which helps to lay up merit in heaven is the best panacea for the troubles and cares of life.

Napoleon Bonaparte, who had as keen an eye for social fallacies as he had for the weak spots in the defenses of his foes, once used these remarks: "How can society as a whole be at present constituted to continue to exist? There is only one means, that of re-establishing religion." He was speaking of the conditions that then existed in revolutionary France. "Society," he said "cannot exist without inequality of fortunes and inequality of fortunes cannot exist without religion. Religion teaches the man who suffers to say: 'God wills it so. In this world there must be rich and poor but hereafter for all eternity it will not be so.'"

Socialists recognize the fact that they have no greater foe to meet than the man with strong faith and the believer in the consoling maxims of Christianity. They know that Christ raised up the lowly man to appreciate his true and overwhelming dignity, and that of being the chosen child of His eternal Father. Christ opened the eyes of the poor man to his true riches, to those which are eternal. So clear was His teaching on it is point that Zacharias vowed that half of his goods he would give to the poor, and he has in return, that same day, that salvation had come to his house.

It has been well said: "The active principle of Christianity is 'give,' whereas the active principle of socialism is 'take.'"

Notwithstanding the Declaration of Independence, all men are not created free and equal. Men are not equal in their talent, in their wisdom or foresight. Were the money of the world divided among the men of the present day, it would be found at the end of a week that they would not be at all equal in their possessions. By social men seek to get more than they possess at the present time. We heard some time ago of a rampant socialist who made regular in his attendance at the lodge and composed in his advocacy of socialism. He suddenly became very lukewarm and delinquent in attending the meetings and rather silent in his advocacy of his former principles. His employer, noticing his change of conduct along these lines, asked him why he did not now attend the meetings of the socialists. He said: "At the last meeting that I attended one of the speakers, in advocating a division of the property in the whole nation, said that if this were done each man would have about \$1,200. Since I have \$2,000 in the bank, I was not going to strengthen or advance a society that would take away \$800 of my money. That is the reason why I have cut out socialism from my programme."

If we wish to see what happens when socialists are given a free hand, we have but to study the history of the French Revolution. Their cry was liberty, equality and fraternity. This cry, translated into action, became hatred, murder and revenge. When the socialists had attained their end after wading through a sea of blood to gain the redistribution of riches, what was the outcome? Society was reconstructed much on the same basis as before. Like the sea, it has its ebb and flow. It is as impossible to realize the dream of the socialist as it is to regulate the ebb and flow of the ocean.

It is quite rapidly developing that the battlefield is the education question, that the fight is over the child; in other words, over the man and woman of the future. The attack of socialism is made upon the four pillars on which society rests — religion, the family, patriotism and private property. We sometimes think that the friends of society are not sufficiently alive to the importance of this question. They sleep in the midst of danger as the soldiers slept in Rome when the enemy was stealthily approaching. Had not the geese awakened the sentinels, the city would have been captured by the stealthy, advancing foe.

We must, however, remember that the bark of Christ has weathered worse storms than now threaten. We must look to Him Who said, "Peace, be still," and seek to spread knowledge and good will among all men.—Catholic Universe.

THE ENCYCICAL OF PIUS X. AND CARDINAL NEWMAN.

By the Right Rev. Mgr. John S. Canon Vaughan.

Since some of the so-called Modernists have sought to establish the Cardinal Newman, and have even contended that he stands in the same condemnation as themselves, on account of his treatise on the "Development of Christian Doctrine," it may be well to clear the air, by calling attention to the following points:

First point. The Encyclical does not condemn all development, but only development of a special kind, as the recent document is careful to explain. As a matter of fact, every theologian admits a growth and a certain unfolding of doctrine. What else, indeed, is the Summa Theologica of St. Thomas, or the twenty-three folios of Suarez, but an illustration in point? Now, it has yet to be proved that Newman's teaching on development passed beyond the bounds of the legitimate and the reasonable. In the very work referred to, he sets forth his idea of development in the following passage:

"Reason is subservient to faith, as handling, examining, explaining, recording, cataloguing, defending, the truths which faith, not reason, has gained for us, as providing an intellectual expression of supernatural facts eliciting what is implicit, comparing, measuring, and meeting each with each, and forming one and all into a theological system. Again in another place he observes:

"Faith, being an act of the intellect, opens a way for enquiry, comparison and inference, that is for science in religion, in subservience to itself; this is the principle of theology."

Surely, this programme is couched in words which have been uttered with complete appropriateness, by the Angel of the schools himself, so little do they trench on forbidden ground.

Second point. It seems to be generally overlooked that Newman composed his "Development of Christian Doctrine" when an Anglican clergyman, some time before his reception into the one true Church; and that, whatever views and opinions the book contains, are views formulated and expressed not by John H. Newman, the distinguished Cardinal of the Holy Roman and Apostolic Church, but by John H. Newman, the Protestant Vicar of St. Mary's Anglican Church, Oxford. To say that Newman, the convert, falls under the condemnation of the Encyclical, on account of what he taught as a Protestant, is stretching a point just a little too far. As well assert that Cardinal Manning falls under the anathemas of the Holy See, for the heresies he inculcated as archdeacon of Chichester.

Third point. If Modernists wish to claim Cardinal Newman as their leader, then at least let them be consistent, and emulate in spirit of childlike obedience and ready submission to the Church's authority. Whatever difference of view may be taken of his book on Development, or of passages in his "Grammar of Assent," there is no room for doubt as to his attitude of mind towards the Holy See and its prerogatives.

Writing in a new edition of his now famous Essay, published after his reception into the Church, and speaking of himself in the third person, Newman says:

"The first act of the author, on his conversion, was to offer his work for revision to the proper authorities, but the offer was declined on the ground that it was written and partly printed before he was a Catholic, and that it would come before the reader in a more persuasive form, if he read it as the author wrote it." Do the Modernists express themselves in similar terms? Do they offer their books for revision? Newman concludes: "It is scarcely necessary to add that the author now submits every part of the book to the judgment of the Church, with whose doctrine, on the subjects of which it

treats, he wishes all his thoughts [obey] to serve; not only his words whether written or spoken, but even his mere thoughts to be coincident."

Does the humble, trustful, loyal spirit, underlying these words, savour of the spirit of the Modernists? Is it the language of Tyrrill in the Times? The simple fact is that Newman was a true Catholic; consequently, in spite of his great intellect and authority, he was content to sit like a little child, at the feet of the teacher appointed by Christ, and would scarcely put forward a view of his own, or even so much as express an opinion, upon any theological subject, without submitting beforehand to any judgment of the Holy See might think fit to pass upon it.

Have the Modernists but imitated the humility and unwavering loyalty of this truly wise man, and suffered themselves to be directed by him, whom God has placed in the Chair of Peter, to rule the nations, they would have spared the world the pitiable and ridiculous spectacle of a handful of erring subjects trying to set right the Church of God.

They appeal to Newman, then to Newman let them go. The following are his own words. Let them subscribe to them, and reduce them to practice, and return to their allegiance. Speaking of a case in which the Pope interfered, Newman writes:

"It is the decision of the Holy See: St. Peter has spoken, it is he who has enjoined that which seems to us so unpromising. He has spoken, and has a claim on us to trust him. He is no rote, no solitary student, no dreamer about the past, no doting upon the dead and gone, no projector of the visionary. He, for eighteen hundred years, lived in the world; he has seen all fortunes, he has encountered all adversities, he has shaped himself for all emergencies. If ever there was a power on earth, who had an eye for the times, who has confined himself to the practicable, and has been happy in his anticipations, whose words have been facts and whose commands prophecies, such is he in the history of a few, who sits from generation to generation in the chair of the Apostles, as the Vicar of Christ and the Doctor of His Church. These — he continues — are not the words of a philosopher, a sage, a man, but of history. All who take part with the Apostles, are on the winning side. He has long since given warrants for the confidence which he claims. From the first he has looked through the wide world, of which he has the burden; and, according to the need of the day, and the inspirations of his Lord, he has set himself now to one thing, now to another; but in all seasons, and to nothing in vain."

Noble words, and as worthy of attention to day, as when they flowed from his pen, over fifty years ago. Let those who use Newman's name, in their shameful rebellion against the august authority of the Sovereign Pontiff, weigh them well, and let us hear no more of Cardinal Newman as the apostle of disobedience and revolt.—Rome.

LETTER FROM ROME.

Correspondence Philadelphia Catholic Standard and Times.

THE POPE'S HEALTH. Several journals, many of them Catholic papers, all over the world have published alarming reports of the Pope's health. We know not the origin of the "news," but this we know: at no time within the past four years was the health of the Holy Father better or more secure.

His Holiness has received some hundreds of foreigners and Italians each day for the past week, except on the Feast of All Saints, which, being a holy day, was given by the Pope to prayer. Indeed, so probable did the evil report appear from its universality that we made it our business to ask a priest fresh from the Papal audience just how the Holy Father looked. The answer given was that the Pope was well and strong, moving briskly among a couple of hundred pilgrims gathered in the chambers destined for audiences.

THE ANTI-RELIGIOUS CAMPAIGN. We have been asked by one of your readers, a non-Catholic, who we know to be both intelligent and broad-minded, for some small particulars regarding the recent campaign in Italy. No doubt many others will be interested in these details.

It must be remembered that the faith is strong in Italy, especially in the country districts. However, in Rome and other cities there is a large number of persons who hate every religion, and pleasure to this world with no thought of the other. Now, the Italian Catholic avoids such a being, but he cannot help hearing his clamor for power and money and greater license. The Italian Socialist will be heard, for he will try to ruin order and destroy all that which attempts to bridge the chasm between the Church and its priesthood. Those he desires to bury, along with the Italian Government—and in this he will fail.

Then we must remember the French Masons' money is at his back, as well as French influence, which, though on the wane, is still powerful—and the darkest wish of the French Mason is the ruin of religion in every country. Along with this we should bear in mind that the well-disposed are not ostentatious, while an irreligious man loves nothing better than notoriety, which can be got by the bushel from one harangue or one insult publicly offered to a minister of religion.

We are asked if an Italian priest differs much from an American or Irish priest. Apart from national temperament and characteristics, he does not, we think. But of this we are sure: American or Irish priests have not so many enemies to withstand as have the priests of Italy. An indifferent Government, too anxious to show "clericalism" the power it usurped, the combined efforts of the most unscrupulous elements in France and Italy, the often schismatic support of Italian Catholics are disadvantages under the like of which the clergy of few countries suffer.

THE MODERNISTS. When Pius X communicated the authors of the Modernists' reply to his recent encyclical, and bound priests under pain of suspension and the laity under pain of mortal sin not to read it, he gave a death blow to Modernism in Rome. All he requires now is that the Modernists reveal themselves, and then His Holiness will excommunicate them by name.

Many falsely think the action of the Vatican too severe. However, grave stakes are at issue. "Modernists are" to use the words of a great modern theologian in Rome, "not theologians, but poets." If they are not satisfied with the Church, they ought to leave her and follow Luther, Calvin, or any of the others who, through pride of intellect or any other reason, did so before.

The latest stroke of English Modernists is to shelter themselves under the mantle of Cardinal Newman, and declare the encyclical "Pascendi" condemned the teachings of the great churchman, whom it is sought to place before the world as the corner stone of modernism. "This," says La Corderie, "recalls the old attempt of the Jansenists when they tried to ascribe their doctrines to St. Augustine. * * * The truth, pure and simple, is that the teaching of Cardinal Newman on the development of dogma has nothing to say to Modernism as condemned by the encyclical. The celebrated apologist throughout all his writings shows himself undeniably an orthodox Catholic, and to-day were he alive, he would be first to subscribe to the encyclical."

And thus the Church has to battle. Yesterday it was her foes, to day her false friends. Who of the two are the more dangerous and yet the more despicable?

Yet it is consoling to notice the manner in which Catholics in Rome are awakening from the "dolce far niente" policy which they had followed. No less than two new papers have been started in Rome this week, both Catholic. One, "Il Bastione," an illustrated humorous journal, sparkling with facts, pointed at anarchists, Socialists, the other, "Il Gazzettino del P. Polo," written chiefly for the benefit of the masses.

PARSING OF OLD PONTIFICAL ZOUAVES. From time to time news reaches Rome of the old Zouaves who fought so nobly against tremendous odds in the Papal army. This past month has seen no less than four pass away full of years and honours.

The first, Cav. Filippo Liverzani, who enlisted under the Pope's flag in 1851 and witnessed the many stirring events that heralded the fall of Papal rule in Italy, died within the last few days in Rome. Cav. Liverzani was decorated with the Cross of St. Gregory the Great, and with that "Pro Fide et Virtute."

Another death is that of the aged Marquis de la Ferronays, once lieutenant in the Legion of Antioch, which occurred in his beautiful French castle on the Loire. He fought at the battle of Mentana, and after the fall of Rome entered the cavalry of his nation.

The two other Zouaves who have passed away are M. Casimir de la Ferrière and M. Paul de Faucher, both of whom, after the disbanding of the Papal army, entered the French service and rose to the rank of captain.

WHY MASONSRY IS BANNED. It is a puzzle to non-Catholics to understand why the Catholic Church forbids her children to belong to secret societies, such as the Order of Masons. This puzzle is chiefly confined to English and American communities, for the openly avowed hostility of most European branches of the Masons to brotherhood to the Catholic faith, and their relentless efforts to crush Catholicism out of existence, leaves no room for doubt as to the reason of their condemnation. In England, however, and doubtless the case is much the same in America, and the English colonies, it is common enough to hear converts to the faith who have been Masons, declare: "Of course, I give up Masonry out of obedience to that Church which I now recognize to be the only true Church of Christ, the divinely appointed guide to men in faith and conduct. But, for the rest, I cannot say that my own experience of the craft has convinced me of its intrinsic wrongfulness. On the contrary, I personally have seen nothing in it but good fellowship, cordiality, mutual aid and promotion of benevolent enterprises and institutions, though these last are generally for the exclusive benefit of Masons and of their families." This, we take it, fairly represents the mind of the average ex-Mason candidate for admission to the Catholic Church.

Now, although a loyal Catholic will consider the veto of the Church reason enough for rejecting Freemasonry, yet he will also feel convinced that this veto must be based upon solid and weighty grounds. Masonry appears wrong to him because forbidden by an authority recognized by him as Christ given. At the same time he is persuaded that it would not have been forbidden unless it were wrong. In what, then, does the evil of Freemasonry consist?

We can find no better words in which to answer the question than those used by Father Hill, S. J., in the Examiner, of Bombay, when summing up his recent criticism of the fraternity.

Our objections to the Masonic Order can, therefore, be summed up as follows: (1) The theological position of Masonry, which makes it a religious sect, embodying the sufficiency of theism, indifference regarding more specific creeds and (by implication), a rejection of the divine claims of Christianity. (2) The secrecy of the aims and methods of Freemasonry, which puts its lower members in the unjustifiable position of supporting a cause which is concealed from their knowledge, and which possibly may be evil. (3) The contradiction of this unjustifiable position by the oath which in itself is wrong for the same reasons. (4) The open and

HOW DO YOU KNOW THAT YOU HAVE NOT KIDNEY DISEASE?

EVERY YEAR THOUSANDS DIE OF NEGLECTED KIDNEYS.

Put Yourself to the Test.

If there are dull aches in the back, or sharp shooting pains through the hips—you have Kidney Disease. If you are uneasy at night, and sleep is broken and fitful—you have Kidney Disease.

If the stomach is upset, tongue coated with white fur, and no appetite—you have Kidney Disease. If there are headaches, that eye-glasses and "headache powders" fail to relieve—you have Kidney Disease. If the hands, feet or ankles are puffy or swollen—you certainly have Kidney Disease.

Know yourself. If you have any of these signs of serious kidney trouble, cure yourself. Take "Fruit-a-tives." These tablets—a wonderful combination of fruit juices and antiseptics—relieve congestion of the kidneys, take away the strain of overwork, regulate the bowels, strengthen the liver, tone up stomach and digestion, and put the whole system in its strongest, best condition.

Get "Fruit-a-tives"—take them regularly—and cure yourself of every trace of Kidney Disease. Your druggist will supply you—or send postpaid on receipt of price—\$6.00 a box; 6 for \$2.50.

Fruit-a-tives Limited, - Ottawa, Ont.

declared anti-Christian policy of Continental Freemasonry, which reflects on English Masonry at least through the solidarity of the Order throughout the world.

"It is on the strength of these reasons that the Church from the first manifestations of the Freemasonic existence, in the year 1717, has firmly and resolutely condemned the Freemasonic Order and forbidden Catholics to join it under pain of forfeiting their Catholic membership. Any one of these four reasons would suffice to justify the Church's prohibition; while the four together constitute an unimpeachable case."

It may be added that what is said above of English Masonry applies equally to the American variety. A further objection to Masonry also suggests itself, namely that Masonry, by passing forward the private interests of individual brothers—especially with regard to promotion in the various public professions—reduces the justice inherent in all favoritism to a regular system. The injustice is twofold—the Mason is advanced independently of his real merit, or demerit, while the more deserving are passed by and the State or community at large suffers injury in consequence by being less well served in its different needs. There are in England no signs as yet of such favoritism having prejudicially affected the ordinary administration of justice. But can one feel equally confident that it never prejudices the just award of punishments in the army or navy?—Pittsburg Catholic.

MODERNISM THAT IS CONDEMNED. Father Lambert says in the Freeman's Journal: Some of the headlines of the day press have placed over the cable dispatch announcing Rome's condemnation of anti-Christian teaching are somewhat misleading. Thus one of the New York dailies announces that "Pope Pius X. bans Modernism." Now, for the man in the street the word modernism stands for the great progress made in real science in our day. He, therefore, having no inclination to read the Encyclical in order to hear what the Holy See condemns, takes it for granted that Pius X. is the avowed enemy of all that has shed so much glory upon the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. Of course, there is no real basis for this belief. What the Holy Father condemns are the insidious attempts to substitute for Christianity a form of religion, which in the last analysis is nothing but a disguised pantheism. What else, pray, is the "New Theology," which is taught by an English clergyman, Rev. Mr. Campbell, has been making such headway in England. It was only the other day that the ecclesiastical authorities of the Episcopal diocese of Western New York deposed the Rev. Dr. Crapsey from the ministry, for advocating this form of "modernism," which would strip our Lord of His divine character and would make nature itself and the whole framework of things "the school, the law of the highest kind of living, which we call religion." In such vague language as this the attempt is made to do away with a personal God. The Protestant churches themselves, unless they would surrender the last vestige of Christianity, should be as one with the Pope in condemning and denouncing this sort of modernism.

You cannot possibly have a better Cocoa than

EPPS'S

A delicious drink and a sustaining food. Fragrant, nutritious and economical. This excellent Cocoa maintains the system in robust health, and enables it to resist winter's extreme cold.

COCOA

Sold by Grocers and Storekeepers in 1-lb. and 2-lb. Tins.