mother sang, has raised the poor dead soul in me, and made the little Irish boy come back after many buried years and sit again in the Irish cabin with the mother who loved him as no one else ever did—the mother whom, in his money madness and greed, he shamefully neglected.

"To-morrow may cover him again with the cloak of human respect and avarice. It is not easy to cast aside the ways of years, be they good or bad, but while the tender memories of the only good I ever knew are uppermost in my heart I must tell you—I who know of the emptiness of all save faith, and loyalty to the best that is in us.

"Is there any young man here to-night fresh from the old land, with the kisses and prayers of a mother still warm on his lips and in his heart? Are the hustle and riches and luxury of the new world already fascinating him and driving out the memory of the songs around the fireside at night, the innocent joys, the wholesome laughter, above all the love of parents and friends and the faith that has made him free? If such a one is among you, let him pause now and think. Can any man rise in the world's estimation by being ashamed of his own origin? You may not realize this now, but the day will come when you will wonder why you lost yourself and what you got for it.

"When I came here thirty years ago, few of our people had wealth or position. I saw the power of money even before I landed; the poor steerage passengers were treated like cattle, and felt like driven beasts, too, as they were let out of the pen in which they were held while they proved their right to enter. I remember on the way over, sitting cold and hungry, because the food was unfit to eat, and watching the dainty food and other luxuries being pressed upon the cabin passengers on the forward deck. I thought bitterly of the poor sick women and children lying amid the foul odors below, and I vowed a vow that, whatever else I might lose, I would gain money in the great country I was going to. Money seemed to me the key that would open all doors, the goal of all earthly enterprises. I didn't think of anything but money, and when I finally began to make it, I couldn't stop. I talked money and thought money, dreamed money and married money. The only man I considered of any account was the man who could make money. The only society I wanted or courted was the society of money.

"How could I keep in touch with the lonely mother in the poor little Irish cabin when my wife was storming heaven and earth to be considered blue-blooded, and I had to play the part of a descendant of a distinguished Cromwellian Irish family?"

"There was a little girl in Ireland, too, to whom I had pledged myself. I thought I could forget her, but I never did. When my wife died five years ago, we both saw at last that our life had been one of emptiness and vain display. But she, at least remained true to the faith of her fathers, and died as she had lived, a staunch Methodist. Our family however is Episcopalian, the society, they claim, being much more fashionable in the Episcopal church—so you see they are worthy chips of the old block.

"I am keeping you from your program, and you are kind and patient to let a lonely old man thrust himself and his troubles upon you. I cannot speak to you as I would wish, for the tears in my heart choke the words in me, but I want to tell you, my friends, that I would give all I have on earth to be fresh from the old sod to-night, as some of you are, with a chance to make a new start. I would put manhood and truth before everything. They are all that count in the beginning, all that matter at the end. Be what you are, and be the best that is in you, and peace and happiness will abide with you through all your days.

"And, now, Father," said John Furlong; tremulously, as he sat down again beside Father Nugent, "will you let me have the honor of again shaking the hand of the young lady who sang my mother's song and made a new man of me?"

"Certainly, Mr. Furlong," answered the priest. "We will all go into my house when the concert is over. She lives with an aunt who comes, by the way, from the village in the County of Meath that you spoke of."

"And her name?" asked John Furlong, eagerly.

"Roche—Miss Margaret Roche. She came over only a few years ago to look after her sister's children, after the sister died. She is the angel of the parish. There is not a sick or suffering soul that she does not seek out and comfort and encourage. I believe she is here to-night,' he added. "I'll ask Nellie to bring her to meet you."

Two hours later the multi-millionaire was walking up Fifth avenue with a springing step and the glad heart of a boy. And on next St. Patrick Day, he and his wife, the sweet-faced and golden hearted lady who had been Miss Margaret Roche, presided over a dinner in the brown stone mansion at which Father Nugent was the guest of honor. Nellie Hyland was also present, and Walter Furlong, John's eldest son, who had been baptized that morning and was to be married to Nellie in June.

At nine o'clock they all drove to St. Malachy's where a banquet was served to the whole parish by John Furlong in honor of the little girl, as he called her, who had raised his soul from the grave of darkness and despair by singing his mother's song.—Teresa Beatrice O Hare in Rosary Magazine.

How to Treat Non-Catholics

Because people differ with us about religion, is no reason why we should hate them. They may be just as sincere as we are. They were brought up in their belief and they think it the truth.

We should pray for them that the Holy Ghost may grant them His light. We should take occasion to give them Catholic books to read. We should explain to them our religion, and, still more important, we should live it, to let them see it in practice. Then we should love them and do them all the good that is in our power.

That's the way for us to treat non-Catholics. That's the way to make converts.—Catholic Columbian.

A REPLY TO ARCHDEACON ARMITAGE

REV. P. W. BROWNE.

II

CONTINUED FROM ISSUE OF FEB. 25th.

Now what does Protestantism stand for? Quite recently a distinguished Jesuit in a sermon preached at Montreal during the Eucharistic Congress, termed it "a soulless religion." This utterance brought forth furious denunciations from Protestant ministers of every sect and profession from Vancouver to Halifax. Father Vaughan did not coin the expression; it was used more than half a century ago by Dr. Wiseman when, in conjunction with O'Connell and Mc. Quinn, he established that famous periodical, The Dublin Review. This was established, as set forth in its first page, to "keep lifted up the mask of beauty under which (the Oxford Movement) had covered the ghastly and soulless features of Protestantism." A recent writer, Chesterton (already proclaimed "a Jesuit in disguise") has a little paragraph in 'Whats' Wrong With The World" which conveys the same thought: "We have actually contrived to invent a new kind of hypocrite. The old hypocrite, Tartuffe or Pecksniff, was a man whose aims were really worldly and practical, while he pretended they were religious. The new hypocrite is one whose many aims are really religious, while he pretends that they are worldly and practical. The Rev. Brown, the Wesleyan minister, sturdily declares that he cares nothing for creeds, but only for education; meanwhile, in truth, the wildest Wesleyanism is tearing his soul. The Rev. Smith, of the Church of England, explains gracefully, with the Oxford manner, that the only question for him is the prosperity of the schools; while, in truth, all the evil passions of a curate are roaring within him. It is *a fight of creeds masquerading as policies*." Here is another estimate of Protestantism, given, strange to say, by the son of an Archbishop of Canterbury: "England has tried Protestantism, and it has broken down. On every side we are witnesses of the rapid whittling away of every vestige of dogmatic teaching. Twenty five years ago England could be called Christian; to-day pandemonium reigns supreme. Comprehensiveness—that is toleration of the most diverse teaching, and of none (in Mr. Campbell's agnostic chapel, for example) is confessedly the distinguishing mark of the Church of England, while in the Free Churches and amongst the Nonconformist bodies, the integrity of the Scriptures, the existence of a future state, and the Divinity of Christ, are little more than speculative theories." To again quote the famous epigrammist, Chesterton: "One age would turn creeds into tendencies. It would tell the Trinitarian to follow multiplicity as such (because it was his "temperment,") and he would turn up later with three hundred and thirty-three persons in the Trinity. Meanwhile, it would turn the Moslem into a Monist: a frightful intellectual fall. It would force that previously healthy person not only to admit that there was one God, but to admit that there was nobody else. When each had for a long enough period followed the gleam of his own nose (like the Dong) they would appear again; the Christian a Polytheist, and the Moslem a Panegoist, both quite mad."

Can it be that the imputation of "soullessness" is merited by Protestantism, and, inferentially by Anglicanism, if Archdeacon Armitage declares, it be Protestant? Religion is the concrete expression of Christian belief. The soul of it is the dogma of Christ's Divinity. Consequently, the vitality of religious belief must be estimated by the clearness of its proclamation that Jesus Christ, the Son of Mary, is Himself the Eternal and Infinite God, and that the object of our love when we worship the crucified Saviour is none other than the Almighty Creator of Heaven and earth. This is a plain statement of the doctrine which lies at the basis of the greatest hopes, and fears, and loves of the human race—the very foundation of religion. Now if Protestantism does not explicitly proclaim and defend this belief it must be soulless. The reader will draw his own conclusions from what follows.

Belief in the Divinity of Christ is a dogma of the Catholic Church. A dogma is a truth appertaining to faith or morals, revealed by God, transmitted from the Apostles in the Scriptures or by tradition, and proposed by the Church for the acceptance of the faithful. A dogma therefore implies a two-fold relation; to Divine revelation and to the authoritative teaching of the Church—the *magisterium docens*, as it is termed in Catholic Theology. The essential factor of this is authority—an element which Protestants repudiate, because, as Archdeacon Armitage and others tell us, they claim "the free and open Bible," i. e., each individual is capable to pick and choose just what seemeth good to him in the pages of Holy Writ. He insists that his sect has a scriptural foundation. He must also have noticed that Mormons, Anabaptists, Christian Scientists, Dunkers, Shakers *et hoc genus omne* have made the same pretensions. Eliminate authority and the Scriptures have no more authority than any other historical document. This was the opinion of St. Augustine who says: "I would not believe the Bible as the word of God unless it had been given me by the Catholic Church;" and Newman says: "The Sacred text was never intended to teach doctrine, but only to prove it, and if we wish to learn doctrine we must have recourse to the formularies of the Church."(Apologie p. 9).

The Archdeacon tells us that "the Church of Rome stands ready to *rob* us of our priceless possession of a *free and open Bible*." Let us suppose for the sake of argument, that an institution abandons a "priceless possession," or that it is unable or unwilling to safeguard it: would the individual or the organization that protects, perserves, and safeguards the priceless possession be called a *robber*? On the contrary, it would be justly and rightly called a guardian. Now this is precisely the position of the Catholic Church in regard to the Scriptures whose abandonment by Protestantism is a byword in the thinking world to-day. Proofs? Yes, enough to satisfy even a latitudinarian. Here are a few, of hundreds—all practically from Protestant sources.

"Will, then, Protestantism leave the championship of Scriptural infallibility to the Church of Rome alone, though the sole basis on which Protestantism rests is undoubtedly the Bible? . . . The position of Rome is unequivocal . . . Protestantism, the great distinguishing feature of which is reliance on the Bible, above and without any other surrenders the keeping of infallibility of that authority to the Church against which it *protested* and from which it separated in the sixteenth century as a fountain of religious error." (New York Sun, of recent date.)

"The Theology of Protestantism in the sense of an infallible Bible doctrine has ceased to exist." (*Thoughts on the Present Position of Protestantism*, Adolf Harnack, p 20).

"What then shall we say of any Protestant doctrine—of the claim that any living authority is present within the Protestant Church, which preserves Christian doctrine intact amid the critical storm—when the very men who are most eager to put it forward are found to be wanting, contradicting each other with regard to the *very rudiments of the faith* which this authority imposes on them even a *belief* in the resurrection of their Lord? . . . Such is the condition to which, as an intellectual system, Protestantism is being reduced by the solvent touch of science that its intellectual bankruptcy becomes more and more evident. . . In exact proportion as Protestantism exhibits its inability to vindicate for itself, either in theory or in practice any teaching authority at all, the perfection of the Roman system, theoretically, and practically alike, becomes in this particular respect more and more obvious" (W. H. Mallock, Nineteenth Century, September, 1907).

But perhaps, Archdeacon Armitage may say: "this is simply the testimony of a rationalist." Be it so. What of this?

"This investigation (criticism) is affecting a change in our conception of what the Bible is which, if not greater, is not certainly less, than the changes involved in the acceptance of heliocentric astronomy." (*Lux Mundi* edited by the Anglican Bishop of Birmingham, Dr. Gore.)

What of this? "His writings (St. Paul's) embody his errors and his blunderings, no less than his truths. He had not the discipline of mind . . . to think out a complete system of theology. The Apostle was unable to think clearly, and consequently could not express what he felt in intelligible form." (Rev. S. Baring-Gould, in "A Treatise on St Paul.")

Just another excerpt, from the High-Priest of Evangelicalism—Dean Farrar. The Dean is illogical, if you will, but "illuminating." The Archdeacon seems to have almost a chattel-mortgage on this word; hence the commas. In Dean Farrar's volume: "The Bible; its Meaning and its Supremacy" he insists that the Bible, from Genesis to Revelation, is a mixture of truth and error; that the view, so prevalent formerly, according to which it was a book demanding in all its facts our credence, or even our respect, would if not abandoned by Christians, reduce their religion to an absurdity; and that the foremost duty of the modern Christian Apologist is to show the skeptic and the infidel that Christians are concerned to defend, not the book as a whole, but select passages only. These, according to the Dean are indeed supernaturally inspired, but all the rest—and the rest is a large portion of it—we may abandon as unconcernedly as we might abandon the books of Livy, to the secular critic who may destroy or spare it as he pleases.

All these opinions are the necessary consequence of the "free and open Bible;" and they prove incontestably that Protestantism dares not presume to fix any standard of belief, define a doctrine, or teach a dogma; for *private judgment* renders any such thing impossible. When we examine the "private judgment" claim, even it seems to be a misnomer; it exists only in theory for its great propounder—Luther—endeavored to prevent its free exercise; and Calvin burned Michael Servetus at the stake for dissenting from Calvinistic teachings. In theory then Protestants are free to indulge in personal choice, and no church authority can gainsay them. Instead of proclaiming the "free and open Bible" Protestantism, says a philosopher of the Dooley school, should proclaim a free and easy religion." It certainly is free. If Lutherans reject the Epistle of St. James because it contradicts "Justification by Faith alone," Anglicans may, for that very reason, or for any other, retain both the Epistle and the doctrine. If Methodists "feel" the divine inspiration of the Four Gospels, Strauss and Harnack are at perfect liberty to question the same. Though Bushnell should deny the Atonement, and Schliermacher the Resurrection, and Gorham the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, none of these men, on true Protestant principles, are less orthodox than the Bishop of London or Archdeacon Armitage; for all, we must presume, have been faithful to the light vouchsafed them. Hence Bishop Bull, defender of the Nicene Creed, is no better, Protestant than is Sir John Seeley, the writer of *Ecce Homo*, or Theodore Parker, assailant of Christ's sinlessness. The good Churchman, therefore, is like Renan's Jew: "One does what one must, and one believes what one can."

The Catholic Church has no desire to "rob" Archdeacon Armitage's Church of the Bible; but it is preserving the sacred deposit from the ruthless assaults of the very men who pretend to base their religious beliefs thereon. She condemns misuse of the Bible because perversion of Holy Writ lies at the bottom of liberalism, latitudinarianism, and rationalism. Can this be true? Let us hear the witnesses.

"In Germany, where there still thunders the echo of Luther's proclamation of religious freedom, the "free and open Bible" has given birth, in orderly succession, to pietism, mythism, rationalism, idealism, sentimentalism and pantheism. In Geneva, the "Rome of Protestantism," where Farel preached and Calvin legislated, Protestant Christianity has developed into a sort of baptized deism, too little Christian, I might almost say, to meet the approbation of a Rousseau, or a Voltaire. In Holland, with insignificant exceptions, the Reformed Churches, have become unevangelical and rationalistic in fact, whatever they may be in name. In Norway, Sweden, and Denmark, there are decided indications of a revival of Odinism, or the old Scandinavian heathenism. In England and Scotland the older deism of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is succeeded by a meagre spiritualism which is only miserable humanism; and in this country (America) Protestantism tends to reject all dogmas, to make Christianity a mere scenic display, and to settle down in a revived necromancy and demon-worship." (Brownson Works, Vol. v. p. 256).

Just a few more excerpts to demonstrate that Protestantism is but a last stage of decay in vital religion:

"We are beginning to see in Protestant Christianity the practical denier of all revelation whatsoever" (Mallock, Is Life Worth Living? p. 272)

"If we are to judge the present position of Christianity by the tests of ecclesiastical history, if we were to measure it by the orthodox zeal of the great doctors of the past, we might well look upon its prospects with the deepest despondency and alarm. The spirit of the Fathers has incontestably failed. The days of Augustine and Athanasius have passed never to return" (Lecky, History of Rationalism in Europe, p. 200) The same writer remarks elsewhere (Map of Life, p. 22): "It should be remembered, too, that on the latitudinarian side the changes that take place in the teachings of the Protestant Church consist much less in the open reprobation of old doctrines, than in their silent evanescence. . . Dogma sinks into the background. . . A silent transition has silently taken place in England among great numbers of educated men, and to some extent under the influence of the clergy, and the comprehensiveness which allows accentuated sacerdotalism and latitudinarianism in the same Church is, in the eyes of many of them, rather an element of strength than of weakness." This we know from the testimony of one of the clergy referred to Rev. Dr. Percival, who writes: "Who but a handful of old-fashioned Tractarians considers himself bound to accept the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England." (Nineteenth Century September 1899, art., *The Future of the Christian Religion*) Still another: "Liberal Christians are the logical outcome of Protestantism. They exhibit the ultimate application of *private judgment*." (*New England Tractarianism*, McChord, in The New World, Vol. v, p. 680). And another:—"Heresy, therefore, has become a light matter so far as the heretic himself is concerned; it is no longer a crime, but a privilege enjoyed by everybody in the Protestant Church, be he minister or layman." (New York Sun).

Surely statements from sources so varied in temper of mind and situation, cannot but go a long way towards producing the conviction that the very fundamental dogmas of Christian faith are being dug about, and further, that the Protestant Church is helpless to save them from ruin. Hence we declare that Protestantism, far from having the "glorious future" which Archdeacon Armitage so loudly and dramatically proclaims, is bound to face the charge that it propagates uncertainty of the fundamental tenet of the Christian faith—the fact of our Lord's Divinity. We substantiate our assertion by precise indications. We begin with France—a country to so great an extent untrue to its Catholic traditions.

In the course of about two hundred years (1695 1990), the number of French Protestants has decreased by some seventy per cent. and of the so-called Protestant Churches fully one third are now tabulated as rationalistic. In this connection we may quote Sabatier, Dean of the Protestant Faculty of Theology in Paris: "In our Protestant Churches it seems to me impossible that one can demand of the theologian, or any one else, a literal adherence to ancient formularies. . . Dogmas did not come down from heaven . . . and dogmas lend themselves without difficulty or violence to transformations and to indefinite interruptions." (*Christian Dogma and the Christian Life*, in the *Contemporary Review*, November 1899.)

The full significance of these words may, perhaps, be best understood by reflecting on the words of Renan: "France has rejected Protestantism. She is the most orthodox country in the world, because she is the most indifferent in religious matters."

As to Switzerland, it may be stated that the Genevan Church, in general, questions the Godhead of the Messiah In Holland, the creed of the Synod of Dort, professing faith in Christ's Divinity, has been replaced by the acceptably indefinite criterion of "Biblical Standards." In Germany, we find that Ritchlianism has supplanted orthodox Protestantism; and it is now almost impossible to find a definite expression of faith in the true Divinity of Christ. So far have the assaults of rationalism been successful that not long since the German Emperor felt himself called upon to head a movement for the revival of Orthodoxy, saying: "What is to become of us if we have no faith in the Saviour, the Son of God? (McSorley, in Ecclesiastical Review, Vol. xxiii., p.p. 379 81.)

But let us turn to England, the loyal land of the Establishment. Mark how disbelief in Christ's Divinity has kept pace with the national Church—that that very organization which Archdeacon Armitage tells us: "Had a glorious past . . has been the chief factor in the making of England . . . and in the moulding of the empire—an empire founded on justice and equity, and with the blessing of God we look for a yet more glorious future." By the way, are not India and Ireland "sad, sweet, Innisfail" (I think the Archdeacon's own natal soil) parts of the British Empire? This, of course by way of parenthesis. England, dear old England is also going the way of the other "free and open Bible" countries because the destructive principle of *private judgment* has been placed in the hands of a people by character disposed to doubt any formularies or dogmas sanctioned by the despised Church of the "Dark Ages." The results evidently have been as fatal as when the use of gunpowder or edge tools is left to the discretion of a mischievous infant. Newman points out the heterodoxy of many Anglican divines and names Archbishops Bramhall, Usher, Laud and Field as fraternizing with heretical sects whose creeds deny Christ's Godhead, and quotes words of Jeremy Taylor that makes the latter's belief in the Divinity of Our Lord "scarcely conceivable." Archbishop Laud was the father of the latitudinarians. Hammond's friend, Lord Falkland, regarded Arianism as having been at one time the teaching of the Church and Grotius, the Arminian, who made the second person of the Blessed Trinity subordinate to the First, was introduced to notice chiefly through Anglican Archbishops. Bishop Hoadly was a Socinian. Archbishop Balguy and Dr. Sturges are other Anglican divines who denied the necessity of belief in the Trinity and the Incarnation; and Archbishop Whately advanced opinions in principle not distinguishable from Socinianism, and was considered by many "essentially a Unitarian." (Vid: Letters to a Prebendary, in particular, *Letter VIII.*, on Hoadlyism; also "Lectures on Anglican Difficulties," in particular, *Letter XII.* and "Letters to the Editor of the Guardian," (1852) in particular *Letter II.*)

A very "illuminating" comment on this feature is a recent "bit of passionate pleading" of Mrs. Humphrey Ward for the recognition of her right to communion in the Anglican Church, though she *disbelieves in the Divinity of Christ*. She claims the same recognition as the advanced ritualists and she cites, in favor of her contention, the words written some time ago by Dr. Horst to Dr. Westcott, in defence of allowing Unitarians to partake of communion in Westminster Abbey: "What is really lost to any great interest by the union for once, of all English Christians? around the altar of the Church?" The significance of Mrs. Ward's appeal is intensified by the fact that Gladstone wrote a Preface for, and was in a large measure responsible for, the circulation of "Robert Elsmere," and possibly "The History of David Grieve." Yet Gladstone is regarded as a former pillar of the Establishment.

All this goes to prove that "Christianity lacking all dogmatic belief is really nothing more than Protestantism in the final stage of decomposition" (*The Logic of Christianity*, in The Fortnightly Review, by W. H. Mallock.) What other result than decline in doctrine can be expected in a Church, even the Church "of a glorious past" when its members or adherents are at liberty, in virtue of the "free and open Bible," to pick and choose among articles of belief? The body of truth committed to the Church of God by its founder is a symmetrical and organic whole. Violently to wrench away its least component part is to inflict a dangerous wound that will soon taint the very life-blood with festering poison. How maintain Christ's Divinity when we have thrust aside His means for nourishing the life of faith? How love Him as God when our public worship gives no indication that we are in the presence of His Incarnate Deity? He is not upon the Protestant altar; they have no altar, for they repudiate the idea of Sacrifice, and thus the memory of Christ's atoning death has faded away from among them. Why then should it be strange that amid the ruin and chaos of Protestantism, faith in Christ's Divinity, left behind like a bit of wreckage on the beach, should now, with the turning of the tide, float away to be lost forever in the vastness of that sea that has no shore?

At the close of his nebulous article Archdeacon Armitage resurrects the "continuity" bogie, and quotes Gladstone to prove? to us that the Church of England is the "same that existed from the beginning" (of what.?) Gladstone also said: "That body (the Church of England) is *supposed* by the law of the country to be the ancient Catholic Church of the country, as well as the national establishment of Religion." Please note the "supposed," which I have italicized. The supposition is ill-founded. "Continuity" there certainly is; but such continuity as admits Anglicans only to Anglic an altars, i, e, if they had altars. Altars postulate a priesthood; but Anglicanism has no valid orders, consequently no priesthood. Anglicans then are simply Anglicans since the organization to which they belong (whatever it may have retained or may be supposed to have retained of Catholic rites and beliefs) lies outside the pale of Catholic jurisdiction, and is consequently a sect. "Protestant" is their self-adopted title and the one upon which they have been wont to pride themselves. But nowadays there is a marked tendency amongst them to renounce this title and grudge Catholics the Catholic name. Fie! Fie! Archdeacon. Why try to "rob" us of our birthright? Evidently, the words of St. Pacian addressed to the Novatian Bishop of old have their application now as formerly: "Why ashamed of your name?" he asks. "Dost thou grudge me my name, and yet shun your own? Think what there is of shame in a cause which shrinks from its own name!" We alone have a right to the Catholic name, because we are members of the kingdom of Christ on earth—a kingdom one and indivisible," at unity with itself" because one in jurisdiction, in organization, and in communion. We "render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God, the things that are God's." We are subject in spirituals to the authority of God's earthly representantative which can never be in abeyance. The Roman Pontiff has no rival in his claims upon us; if we give him up "to whom shall we go?" Over against that Church international and world-wide, of which he is the visible head, are mere national Churches necessarily erastianized, since no mere national Church can withstand the secular power. "Where are the instances in proof," asks Cardinal Newman, "that a church can cut off Catholic intercommunion without falling under the power of the State? It is then truly a Branch Church (a sect); for, as a branch cannot live of itself, therefore, as soon as it is lopped off from the body of Christ, it is then straightway grafted upon the civil constitution, if it is to preserve life of any kind. The English Establishment is nothing extraordinary in this respect; the Russian Church is erastian, so is the Greek; such was the Nestorian; such would be the Scotch Episcopal, such the Anglo-American, if ever they became commensurate with the nation."

I have now dealt with the Archdeacon's claims for his sect, less briefly than I would wish; but it were unfair to your readers to inflict more upon them in order to demonstrate that the unspeakable Henry VIII. brought "woes unnumbered" to the land which a St. Cuthbert, a St. Aidan, and a St. Augustine labored and prayed for. We would suggest that the Archdeacon give up the "whitewashing" business and carve a *Hic Jacet* on the tomb of "the greatest rascal in modern history"; and if I may suggest an epitaph it would be a paraphase of that which Voltaire suggested for the mother of a certain Gallic King. Here it is: "Ci-git Méchancéte, Père de tous les vices."

As these articles will go beyond the capacity of the RECORD, they will be published in pamphlet form, at an early date.

AN ORANGE LEADER'S UNLUCKY QUESTION

THE WHOLE OF LIVERPOOL IS LAUGHING OVER THE TRAM CAR INCIDENT.

Liverpool, Jan. 28.—The inconvenience which often results from asking too many questions was sorely felt the other day by Mr. George Wise, the well known Orange Protestant stalwart of Liverpool, whose name has appeared in undesirable connection with religious rioting in that city.

Mr. George Wise—such is the account now enlivening the columns of the Liverpool papers—entered a tram-car. He is a man of somewhat large proportions, and, the car being full, was at a loss where to deposit his person. A small boy, however, rose and courteously offered his place to the newcomer. The latter was effusive in his recognition of the courtesy.

"It is nice to find such politeness nowadays among schoolboys. Your behavior is a credit to yourself and to your school. May I ask what school you attend?"

Prompt and deadly came the reply, "St. Francis Xavier's School, sir."

That, as many of our readers know, is a school under Jesuit management, and any one who has read the gruesome chronicles of Mr. Wise's public speeches and militant deeds will see at once the praise of Jesuits—even of an indirect kind—was the last thing he would willingly have accorded. So keenly did his fellow passengers appreciate this irony of fate—for Wise is well known in Liverpool—that the boy's answer was greeted with general laughter. Mr. Wise subsided moodily into the place which he owed to Jesuit training, regretting, no doubt, his indiscreet curiosity.

Had the teaching of a Kempis entered into his philosophy, he might have meditated fruitfully upon the words: "I have often regretted having spoken, but seldom having kept silence.—Providence Visitor.

IN CASE OF ACCIDENT OR SUDDEN ILLNESS

HOW TO ACT TOWARDS ONE SUDDENLY STRICKEN HELPLESS AND POSSIBLY DEPENDENT FOR ETERNAL SALVATION UPON THE COOLNESS, CHARITY AND CATHOLICITY OF A STRANGER

It often happens that people are attacked by sudden and severe illness or are seriously injured. As a rule, the bystanders become greatly excited, lose their composure, run hither and thither seeking bodily remedies and hasten for a physician. Only occasionally does anybody think of the man's spiritual condition, which is vastly more important than corporal relief. In cases of this kind remember that the dying man's eternal salvation may depend upon your individual action. So, no matter how agitated others become, you must keep cool, tell the sufferer to make as perfect an act of contrition as he can, or at least to say, "Lord, have mercy upon me and forgive my sins." Then send some one to the nearest store to telephone for the priest to come. Most priests have telephones in their houses, because they foresee that perhaps the salvation of an immortal soul may depend upon the celerity with which the priest receives information with regard to accidents or sudden sickness of people in his parish. If you cannot get the local priest, telephone to the next nearest, explain where the sick person is and also tell that you have been unable to get a priest from the district.

In any of these cases act just as you wish other Catholics would do for you if our turn should come to be suddenly stricken helpless and dependent for eternal salvation upon the coolness, charity and Catholicity of some stranger.

In the name of God don't allow human respect (which is only another name for cowardice) to keep you from doing your full duty to the soul which is to pass into eternity so soon. No matter how many infidels, Protestants or sham Catholics may be present, kneel by the side of the dying person, recite the "Confiteor" tell him that he is in proximate danger of death and to prepare his soul as well as he possibly can. If he is unable to speak, say the "Act of Contrition" for him in a tone loud enough for him to hear. Then say frequently, "Jesus, Mary, Joseph, assist him in his last agony." If you belong to the "Bona Mors" confraternity you will often repeat, "Sacred Heart of Jesus, have mercy upon the dying."

Many Catholics always carry a crucifix in their pocket. If you do not, ask those assembled for a crucifix, and if you get it press it to the dying man's lips. He will understand what it means.

Almost every Catholic carries his beads or rosary with him; there is a cross on each, and use it if a crucifix be not available.

All the preceding attention presupposes that the patient is a Catholic. This you can discover if you ask him, or if you request such information from the bystanders. If you are in doubt, or are even certain that he does not belong to the "body" of the Church, you have no right to presume that he does not want to belong to the "soul" of the Church. Ask him if he wishes to be baptized and to die in the friendship of God. You may be surprised at his willingness. There is many a man in good faith who desires to do God's will, and yet for some cause or other, for which he is not wholly responsible, is not formally affiliated with Christ's Church.

Of course, you know that in case of necessity, where it is practically impossible to obtain a priest in time, you or anybody else can and must baptize. You must have the intention to do what the Church intends should be done on such on occasion, and be careful to pour water on the head of the person to be baptized at the same time that you pronounce the words, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." In case the head should be in such a position (through accident) that you could not reach it, the baptism would be valid if the water be poured upon any part of the flesh. It would not be sufficient to pour it upon any part of his clothing. The person, and not the clothing, is to be baptised.—Pilot.

CAPTAIN JACK CRAWFORD'S TRIBUTE TO CATHOLIC SISTERS

On all God's green and beautiful earth, earth, there are no purer, no nobler, no more kind-hearted and self-sacrificing women than those who wear the sombre garb of Catholic Sisters. During the war, I had many opportunities for observing their noble and heroic work, not only in camp and hospital, but on the death-swept field of battle. Right in the fiery front of dreadful war, where bullets hissed in maddening glee, and shot and shell flew madly by with demoniac shrieks, where dead and mangled forms lay with pale blood-flecked faces, yet wearing the scowl of battle, I have seen the blacked-robed Sisters moving over the field, their solicitus faces wet the tears of sympathy, administering to the wants of the wounded and whispering words of comfort into the ears soon to be deafened by the cold implacable hand of death. . . . How many a veteran of the war, who wore the Blue or the Gray, can yet recall the soothing touch of a Sister's hand, as he lay upon the pain-tossed couch of a hospital! Can we ever forget their sympathetic eyes their low, soft spoken words of encouragement and cheer when the result of the struggle between life and death yet hung in the balance? Oh! how often have I followed the form of that good Sister Valencia, with my sunken eyes, as she moved away from my cot to the cot of another sufferer, and have breathed from the most sacred depths of my faint-beating heart the fervent prayer, God bless her! God bless her!

"My friend, I am not a Catholic, but I stand ready, at any and all times, to defend these noble women, even with my life, for I owe that life to them"—Denver Register.

Perseverance in righteousness brings increase in spirituality. For "He who sows sparingly; shall reap also sparingly; and he who sows bountifully shall reap also bountifully."

To practise charity perfectly, it behooves us to watch strictly over our thoughts, lest unjust suspicions and rash judgments should find an entrance into our minds and forfeit the good opinion we should have of our neighbor. "Why judgest thou thy brother?" asks St. Paul, "or why dost thou despise him? For we must all stand before the judgement-seat of Christ."—Rev. Louis Bronchain, C. SS.R.

Cowan's

Nut Milk Chocolate

A chocolate confection of rich milk chocolate and fresh shelled walnuts. Simply exquisite. In ¼ and ½ pound cakes.

The Cowan Co. Limited, Toronto. 21

BLOOD BAD IN THE WINTER

INDOOR LIFE, TOO LITTLE EXERCISE, BREATHING IMPURE AIR, EATING ARTIFICIAL FOODS

Is it any wonder that the system becomes poisoned with impure waste matter in the winter time when you think of the artificial life we lead?

With doors and windows tight shut we breathe the same air over and over again until it is incapable of purifying the blood.

In vain effort to cast the poisons out of the system the liver and kidneys are worked over time until they too are played out. Then comes the pains in the back, the headaches, the attacks of constipation and indigestion.

The quickest and most certain way to overcome this condition is by the use of Dr. Chase's Kidney-Liver Pills. They act definitely and directly on the liver and kidneys, awaken them to renew energy in filtering poisons from the bowels and remove the cause of indigestion, backache and other body pains.

You are not experimenting when you use Dr. Chase's Kidney-Liver Pills. They are unique in their combined action on the liver and kidneys and for this reason stand without a rival as a means of purifying the blood and cleansing the filtering and digestive systems.

One pill a dose, 25 cents a box at all dealers or Edmanson, Bates & Co., Toronto.