

IMITATION MASSES.

It is strange to Catholics to read of the "celebration of Mass in Protestant churches; but a ceremony in imitation of the great sacrifice, it seems, is performed everyday for the benefit of several Episcopalian congregations in New York, and on Sunday and certain feast days there is a "Solemn High Mass."

The New York *Sun* of a few days ago gave a description at some length of a "Solemn High Mass" sung at St. Martin's church, in Brooklyn, in honor of St. Martin, after whom the church was named. The Rev. W. O. Riddle—Father Riddle, as he prefers to be called—was the celebrant, assisted by deacon and sub-deacon, and they wore vestments similar to those used by Catholic priests. There were acolytes, and incense was used, and the Mass was performed strictly according to the Catholic liturgy, except that the English language was used instead of the Latin.

The *Sun* states that Masses are also said at the churches of St. Mary the Virgin and St. Ignatius, in New York city. The paper adds that since the introduction of the ritualistic functions the churches have been crowded, showing that the people much prefer this to the former plain and barren rites. What the Protestant ministers who conduct these Masses believe concerning them might be interesting to know. Perhaps, as usual, views among them are divided and are not clear. Do they hold to transubstantiation and consider that after the words of consecration are pronounced there are present in the elements the real body and blood of Our Lord?

If not, what is the purpose and significance of these splendid Masses with their music, priests, acolytes, thurifers, and candles? Is the rite intended merely as a spectacle and a device to attract and interest a large congregation?

"Playing at Catholicism," this sort of performance used to be called by the Low Church Episcopalians, who objected to it. But, as the large attendance at the churches where it is carried on shows, the people evidently like it. The mystery is that they should be content with the lame and imperfect rite—the ineffective shadow of the real thing. Why do they not attend the true Sacrifice of the Mass in the Catholic Church, where they may obtain some of the spiritual graces and benefits vouchsafed to those who assist at it in the proper devout spirit?—*Catholic Mirror*.

HOME RULE AND IRISH LOYALTY.

To the Editor of the *Globe* :

SIR,—Could I believe that an Irish Parliament would tend to the dismemberment of the empire, or the oppression of the Protestant minority, my last word would have been spoken, my last sentence written for Home Rule. But since, on the contrary, I verily believe that the integrity of the British Empire is doomed, and that in the near future, unless the various constituents of that empire have granted to them local self-government and are brought into more harmonious relations with the central government, I cannot but persist in my advocacy of the measure. If the dismemberment of the empire is to be averted, we must adopt the federal system of America—local parliaments, and representation at Westminster. Ireland is not alone in asking for Home Rule. India is ripe for it, and the editorials of the native press are uncomfortably suggestive to the British rulers of that empire. Nearly four millions of Irishmen ask for a parliament to-day, over two hundred millions in British India will ask to-morrow. Britain should set her house in order, and wisely and gracefully prepare to concede the inevitable. In doing so she may bind to herself in bands of steel every one of her colonies and her three hundred millions of subjects, and advance with increased vigor and momentum in the spread of Christian civilization.

The attitude of Lord Salisbury and the so-called Unionists of to-day reminds me forcibly of the advisers of poor old George III. from 1765 to 1776. Never was there a more respectful or a more reasonable document presented to a deliberative body than the petition and the remonstrances sent by the thirteen colonies to Westminster. But, in spite of the entreaties of the grand old man of that day, and a few others possessed of political foresight and an inherent sense of rectitude, the colonies were spurned and insulted, and their petition treated with contempt. A century passes, and Englishmen like Mr. Howard Vincent "deplore the madness of those who, invested with a brief season of power, lost to Great Britain the vast continent now inhabited by 60,000,000 Americans."

No one believes that loyalty could have been developed in Ireland by the treatment she has received through the past centuries. Had she been on this side the Atlantic, she would have received very different treatment, or she would have gone with the thirteen colonies. She is held by force, and by keeping her

children divided, and, while in that condition, she is as much lost to England as if she were out of existence. For, even if we grant that the Ulster quarter is equal in strength to the other three, still, should an emergency arise, so far as aiding England is concerned she would count for nothing. Yet men will pose as statesmen, while advocating such a state of affairs. Is that the best that the lords of England can do to-day? Does any one believe that an intelligent patriotism inspires their conduct? It was worthy of notice that the House of Lords was unanimously opposed to the colonies, and until 1886 the present House of Lords had only one peer—Lord Dalhousie—who ever favored Home Rule. It is a House of landlords.

The thirteen colonies never submitted to a tithe of the wrongs under which Ireland has groaned. Her petitions for redress have been moderation itself, but they have been contemptuously rejected, and to add insult to injury, coercion bills have usually been thrown in by way of postscript. Ireland has asked for bread; she has received a stone. Do you wonder that some poor wretch may be so lacking in gratitude as to hurl it back with words more emphatic than loyal? Driven to the wall, goaded to desperation, Irishmen have expressed their indignation, as Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson and Benjamin Franklin did in America. Englishmen, as well as the rest of the world, applaud the Americans, and most of the great Englishmen who have studied the Irish question have admitted that Ireland has had provocation intolerable. No man has admitted this more fully than Mr. Goldwin Smith; and yet he would have us believe that these outbursts of indignation were sufficient proof that Ireland cannot be trusted with self-government. With all due deference to the learned professor, and with as strong a desire for the integrity of the empire as he possibly can have, I affirm without hesitation that Ireland would have proved herself unworthy of self-government had she tamely submitted to the degrading treatment she has received during this last century. If there is one thing that I rejoice in it is this, that self-respect is not entirely crushed out of my countrymen. There's life in the old land yet. Her ideas of liberty are the same as England's; her sense of national honor equally high. Her very outbursts of indignation show that she is entitled to something better than sneers and coercion bills, and it is only by a full and frank recognition of these facts that England can ever hope for the hearty and loyal support of Ireland.

Men profess to be astonished that Ireland is not gushing with loyalty. The honest Englishman rather wonders that Irish blood has flowed so freely in support of British interests. When Pitt said in the British House of Commons: "I rejoice that America has resisted. Three millions of our fellow-subjects so lost to every sense of virtue as tamely to give up their liberties would be fit instruments to make slaves for the rest," his words had the true British ring. They honored both the speaker and his audience, and find their echo to-day in the hearts of free men under every sky. I apply them to my countrymen, and declare it as my solemn conviction that had Ireland shown less of resistance against the iniquitous measures forced upon her she would have forfeited her right to the respect of free men everywhere. Even Britons would have held her in contempt.

It is time that her enemies should cease magnifying Irish outbreaks. Let them rather "deplore the madness of those who, invested with a brief season of power," goaded the people to desperation and called it statesmanship. The verdict of the student of history to day is, that Ireland never struck a blow till patience had ceased to be a virtue. Mr. Goldwin Smith refers to an American senator who "palliated the Phoenix Park murders," and of course would leave the impression that in doing so he reflected the sentiments of the Irish people. Nothing could be more unfair, and in Mr. Smith's case it is sadly excusable. He is thoroughly conversant with current history and knows well that no people could have repudiated and denounced that terrible crime more fully than the Irish leaders. Sullivan wrote of "the accursed crime, the bloody deed, the cowardly slaughter of two unarmed and inoffensive men." O'Connor wrote: "The evil fortune that has so blighted the Irish cause on the threshold of victory intervened, and the cause of Irish victory has been thrown back for years." McCarthy was equally outspoken, and Parnell, Davitt and Dillon issued a manifesto, which said, "We feel that no act has been perpetrated in our country during the struggles of the past fifty years that has so stained the name of hospitable Ireland as this cowardly and unprovoked assassination of a friendly stranger, and until the murderers are brought to justice that stain will sully our country's name." The whole country denounced the crime in