

conceal or disguise their opinions or sentiments. Father Ryan hoped they might all become good Catholics. Anglicans declared themselves devoted to the English Church, and Methodists to Methodism. Those in agreement with them cheered. Those who disagreed did the same, or smiled—no one quarrelled. This is really a point of importance and significance, and is a sign of the times.

The most remarkable indication of this kind was the great meeting at the Massey Hall on Sunday afternoon, at which about three thousand persons of all denominations were present. Father Ryan made an excellent and genial chairman; and the papers by Dr. Eby, lately a Methodist Missionary in Japan, and Dean Harris, of St. Catharines, were beyond all praise. The paper of Dean Harris was a noble tribute to the self-sacrificing lives of the martyr missionaries of the great Roman Catholic orders.

It is not quite easy to select papers from so great a multitude, nor was it in the power of any one member of the Congress to be present at all the meetings, as some of them were held contemporaneously. But a few samples may be selected for comment. The paper on Friday morning by President Rogers, of the North Western University at Evanston, Illinois, on Christianity and Education, was of first rate excellence; and we hope it may be printed. The other papers at the same meeting were also good. On Saturday morning the paper of Miss Jane Addams, of Chicago, was deservedly received with great enthusiasm. It was a noble plea for the wretched and suffering, and a touching account of what was being done for them. Dr. Morgan Wood, of Detroit, spoke with much vehemence and eloquence on the adaptation of the Church to modern life; and much that he said was true; but a great deal was also one-sided. Mrs. Wood spoke with power and eloquence on "Our Girls."

The Saturday evening meeting was of great interest, Father Ryan discoursed eloquently on the Organization of Charity and the Catholic Church, and Mrs. Rogers read a charming paper, which was imperfectly heard, on "Recent Progress in Philanthropy." Professor Blackman, of Yale University, came last, and, in spite of the lateness of the hour, gained the thorough attention and interest of his audience whilst philosophically and eloquently expounding the principles of the Family and the State. Few men at the Congress produced a more favourable impression than this speaker, whose address as President of one of the sectional meetings on Philanthropy was one of the best delivered.

The meeting on Monday morning—"Editors' Day"—was one of the best. Dr. A. Edwards, editor of *North Western Advocate*, Chicago, gave a most charming and powerful paper on "Reforming Printer's Ink"—that is to say, improving the press, and many practical suggestions made by him deserve to be remembered. Equally good was the paper by Dr. Courtice, the new editor of the *Christian Guardian*, on "Subjective and Objective Methods of Reform," and the eloquent address of Major Mervin, editor of the *American Journal of Education*, on the "Press as an Educational Factor."

The meeting on Monday evening was one of the best of the whole Congress. There were only two papers, so that neither had to be curtailed. That by Dr. Burwash, on the "Correlation of Intelligence, Religion, and Morality," was almost as good as it could be, but the enthusiasm of the audience was raised to the uttermost by the splendid oration of the Coadjutor Bishop of Minnesota, on the "Outlook for Church Unity." There were many present who could not agree with the eloquent speaker; but there were none who did not sympathize with his spirit, and listen with delight to his words. One of the most striking addresses delivered at the Congress was that on Tuesday morning by Dr. Conaty,

Rector of the Sacred Heart, Worcester, Mass., on the "Roman Catholic Church in the Educational Movement of To-day," in which he eloquently repudiated the notion that the Church of which he is a member had neglected her work as the teacher of mankind.

It is impossible for us to comment at length upon the sectional meetings, many of which were of great interest, but a few remarks must be made upon the disappointment of the Congress, at the non-appearance of Archbishop Ireland, of St. Paul, Minnesota. We assume that the Archbishop had sufficient reason for breaking his engagement; and we can quite understand the somewhat strong language used by the President, Dr. Smith. As regards the complaint, that notice ought to have been given before the meeting assembled, we can quite understand that either method should be adopted without there being reasonable cause for fault-finding. No one was injured, as there was no charge for admission. It would have been extremely difficult to give, in a newspaper paragraph, the explanation which Dr. Smith gave by word of mouth. Moreover three excellent speeches were substituted—Mrs. Mountford's speech was eloquent and telling, and Dr. Bennett's was a powerful presentation, perhaps a little one-sided, of the claims of labour. Dr. Smith's character stands so high that he needs no defence at our hands, and we can only regret that some persons should have failed, not merely in generosity, but in justice, in commenting upon the course he adopted.

On the whole, then, our judgment must be that the Congress was successful beyond reasonable expectations. But, for all that, we think it might be improved, and we will offer a few suggestions for that purpose.

In the first place, readers and speakers should be kept rigidly to time. Let this be clearly understood, and there would be no cause of complaint. It is unfair to the audience and to the later speakers to break this rule.

Secondly, let the music be dispensed with, except, perhaps, at the evening meetings, which might, with advantage, be of a more popular character.

Thirdly, a greater unity of subject should prevail at each meeting, and might be realized in some such manner as this. Give the general subject to the first reader with thirty or five-and-twenty minutes; some aspect of it to the second with twenty minutes; and to the third, who should speak rather than read, give fifteen minutes. Then might follow as many volunteer speeches of ten minutes each as the time would allow. This is very important. It would not only lighten the burden of the hearers, but it would attract outsiders who might wish to take part in the discussion.

Another point is debatable—the abandonment of sectional meetings. It is quite true that this would somewhat diminish the area of subjects; but the gain would be greater than the loss. In some cases two subjects of great importance were being discussed at the same time—a very vexing circumstance to those who were interested in both.

It is a matter of question whether a Congress extending from Tuesday to Friday would not be long enough.

Finally, it would be well frankly to give up one afternoon, or more than one, for recreation, visiting places of interest in the city, and the like. It is not well that this should be done whilst the Congress is actually in session.

These remarks are made in all friendliness and good will, and with no thought of fault-finding. We believe that the adoption of these suggestions will be of advantage to the further development of the Congress; and we sincerely hope, as also we believe, that such meetings are calculated and likely to be of inestimable value, socially and religiously, in the future.