

HOW A SCHOOLMASTER BECAME A CATHOLIC.

LETTER XVII.

All along, in speaking of the Catholic Church, I have, in defiance of the propriety expected by Catholics, applied the single word Catholic to the Church, whose visible head is St. Peter's successor, without qualifying it with Roman. This may be called either a pitiable error, or a piece of studied impertinence. Had I carefully studied facts, I should have recognized that there is but one Catholic Church, and that this one Catholic Church exists in three segregated and distinctly independent parts, the "Catholic" (Anglican) Church, the Greek Church, and the Roman Church. The problem may be easy enough, but it has been altogether too hard for me. And that three dissociated and unconnected units make one solid unit, is thoroughly understood, I have found out, by none but a small section of modern Anglicans. These men say that the English Church, as by law established, although independent of and separated from any other Church, is a branch of the Catholic Church, if not the major and most important branch; that it is really the ancient British Church, which in the 16th century shook itself free of the Roman yoke and superstitions which Pope Gregory the Great so artfully and impudently imposed upon it; that the "Roman" Church in England is a schismatical body; and that throughout the British Empire the Anglican Church is the Catholic Church. In continuation they aver that prior to the 6th century the British Church knew nothing of St. Peter's Primacy; that the superstitious beliefs and practices that bedeviled the pure faith for about nine hundred years were importations from Rome; that at the beginning of the 16th century the conscience of their Church awoke to a sense of its corruptions and its servile submission to Rome, and reformed itself; and that it is now, not a Protestant Church, but the Catholic Church, standing before the world as a witness to the truth, in all its pristine purity.

I adduce most unexceptional evidence to show that the earliest churches in the British Islands were established by Roman authority and teaching. Collier (Vol. I, p. 27) says: "What progress was made upon the infidels; in what parts the Church was settled, and under whom; what successes or discouragements; what revolutions happened in the ecclesiastical history of this island, from the apostles to King Lucius, is altogether uncertain. Length of time, persecutions, and the ravages of war have, in a manner, sunk the memory of these matters." And, on page 28, he quotes Bede for this: "That in the reign of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, and his partner in the empire, Lucius Verus, when Eleutherius was bishop of Rome, Lucius, a British king, sent a letter to this prelate, desiring his directions to make him a Christian. The holy bishop immediately complied with this pious request; and thus the Britons being brought over to Christianity continued without warring or disturbance, till the reign of the emperor Diocletian." On page 29 he gives, from the old book of Llandaf, this extract: "That King Lucius sent Eleutherus, the twelfth bishop of Rome, to desire that he might be made a Christian by his instruction. Upon which the Pope gave God thanks that such a heathen nation were so earnest in their applications for Christianity. And then, by the advice of the priests of the city of Rome, they first baptized these ambassadors, and afterwards instructing them more fully in the principles of the Christian faith, they proceeded to ordain them, making Eleutherus a bishop, and Medwinus a teacher; and they, being thus qualified, returned to King Lucius, who, with the chief of the Britons, was baptized; and then, according to the form of Eleutherus's instructions, the ecclesiastical order was settled, bishops were ordained, and the Christian religion farther propagated among the inhabitants." "This account," says Collier, "carries a great air of truth, and seems to have been the original tradition of the British Church." It seems from this, now that the British Church did know something of Rome before the time of Gregory the Great. And the very fact that King Lucius sent direct to Rome for Christian instruction, passing through France, where Christianity was well known and taught, shows that he regarded the Bishop of Rome as the chief instructor of Christianity. So much for south Britain. Palmer (Church, vol. I, p. 216) says: "In fine, Scotland received Christianity, and visible churches were founded there by the Irish and Saxon churches." On page 215, he has: "About the same time (432) the Irish Churches were founded by Coelstinus (Pope); and these churches were acknowledged immediately, by all the Christian world, to form part of the Catholic Church." Collier (vol. I, p. 117) has: "In the year of our Lord 431, Palladius, as Prosper informs us, was consecrated bishop by Pope Celestine, and sent ad Scotos in Christum credentes, i. e., to the converted Scots in Ireland. This author, in his book, Contra Collatorem, mentioning the care Celestine had to drive Pelagianism out of Britain, adds, that 'the Pope by sending the Scots a bishop, not only secured a Roman island in its orthodoxy, but likewise brought a barbarous one to Christianity. Upon the death of Palladius, Celestine is said to have sent St. Patrick to succeed him, who is supposed to have been the second archbishop in that island. This St. Patrick was furnished with extraordinary qualifications, to make him big enough for his undertaking. . . . When he came to his charge in Ireland he was wonderfully successful there, and made, as it were, a thorough conversion of the country.' In the Canons of St. Patrick, which Usher admits to be genuine, appeal in the last resort is commanded to be made to 'sedem Apostolicam. . . . id est ad Petri Apostoli Cathedram, auctovitatem Romae urbis habentem.'"

The British Churches, then, were established in the faith by Roman agency; and it is historically certain that they acknowledged the primacy of St. Peter. At the Council of Arles, 314, the British Bishops of York, London, and Lincoln, who concurred with the others, "that the feast of Easter should be celebrated on the same Sunday in all the Churches of the world" (Du Pin), must have heard at the same

time, "that according to custom the Bishop of Rome should give notice of the day to the churches." Du Pin says, too: "At last the bishops of this council wrote to St. Sylvester, Bishop of Rome, as the chief bishop of the world, an account of everything that they had ordained, that he might publish these canons throughout the Catholic Church." This is Du Pin's abstract, a mild one no doubt. Dr. Ives quotes Fleury at length for the conclusion, and in it there is, "since you (Sylvester) have the greatest part in the government of the Church." And the same is in "the chief bishop of the world," the chief bishop must wield the chief authority. British bishops were also at the Council of Sardica A. D. 347, respecting appeals to the Bishop of Rome. In the report to Pope Julius, the bishops of this Council said: "This will seem to be excellent and very suitable, if, to the head, that is, to the seat of the Apostle Peter, the priests of the Lord from the several provinces report." (Hoc enim optimum et valde congruentissimum esse videbitur, si ad caput, id est, ad Petri Apostoli sedem, de singulis quibusque provinciis Domini referant sacerdotes) In 423, when Pelagianism was rampant in Britain, Pope Celestine, according to St. Prosper, interfered to suppress it. "At the instance of the deacon Palladius, Pope Celestine sends Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre, in his own stead (vice sua), that he may drive out the heretics and bring the Britons to the Catholic faith." On this subject Archbishop Kenrick remarks: "Those who assert the original independence of the British churches, and their autocephalous character, forget their Roman origin, the presence of their prelates in councils in which the prerogatives of the Holy See were distinctly recognized, and the interposition of Pope Celestine to extirpate the heresy of Pelagius, through his envoy Germanus."

But when the Saxons invaded Southern Britain, what of the Church was not annihilated was driven to the wilds. Milman (L O C) says: "But all were swept away, the worshippers of the saints, and the followers of the heretics, by the Teutonic conquest." Greene (Hist. Eng.) says: "But in Britain the priesthood and the people had been exterminated together." Still we are not to suppose the destruction so thorough that all the Christians fell a prey to the sword. Milman has: "Christianity receded with the conquered Britons into the mountains of Wales, or towards the borders of Scotland, or took refuge among the peaceful and flourishing monasteries of Ireland." Again: "the clergy fled, perhaps fought with their flocks, and neither sought nor found opportunities of amicable intercourse, which might have led to the propagation of their faith." So for more than a century the few survivors of the British Church were cut off from all intercourse with the centre of unity. Driven from their homes and churches, which were totally destroyed, and reduced to the condition of scattered fugitives, they would hardly be able to preserve their wonted ecclesiastical status, or to keep vividly in mind all their old rites and customs. But their hatred of the Saxons seems to have been bitter and fixed. Milman says: "Nor was there sufficient charity in the British churches to enlighten the paganism of their conquerors. They consoled themselves (they are taunted with this sacrifice of Christian zeal to national hatred) for the loss of their territory, by the desolation of their conquerors, which they were not generous enough to attempt to avert; they would at least have heaven to themselves, undisturbed by the intrusion of the Saxon. Happily Christianity appeared in an opposite quarter." The word happily seems, in the circumstances, to be sagaciously used; for, by the British the English world never perhaps have been rescued from paganism. Like the British, the English were to get their Christianity from Rome. And the controlling mind of the great work was Gregory the Great, a monk, St. Augustine, aided by a train of monks. "Unless," says Milman, "he had been a monk, Augustine would hardly have attempted, or have succeeded in the conversion of Britain." "The missionaries landed in 597," says Greene, "on the very spot where Heugist had landed more than a century before in the Isle of Thanet. . . . It is strange that the spot which witnessed the landing of Heugist should be yet better known as the landing place of Augustine."

The conversion of Ethelbert and his nation soon followed. And right here I must observe that Augustine was a "Roman;" he and his attendants invoked the saints, prayed for the dead, performed miracles, purified with holy water, made the sign of the cross, made processions with a "crucifix of silver" and a "picture of the Redeemer born aloft." Augustine tried hard to obtain the aid of the British in his mission labors; but they met him only to quickly withdraw themselves on the pretence of an affront, ridiculously frivolous, and at the very utmost but three points of difference. They were out of the correct reckoning in keeping Easter; had a peculiar rite in baptism; and used the tonsure of St. John, by "which the front of the head was shaved so as to resemble a crescent, or semi circle, and the hair allowed to fall down upon the back." On nothing else was the sign of a difference started. But, on the supposition that the British church was the immaculate original of the modern Anglican, the Britons ought to have drawn up a pretty long list of "superstitions" that they indignantly abhorred; while the Anglicans to be faithful representatives of their old stock, should agree with them in keeping Easter, in their baptismal ceremony, and especially in the "primitive" tonsorial style. Had the Britons differed much from the "Romanists" Augustine would scarcely have sought their aid. It is generally said that the Britons took umbrage at the arrogant bearing of St. Augustine and so refused to co-operate with him; the greater probability is that their hatred of the Saxons blinded them to their duty, and disposed them to attach importance to differences which in other conditions they would have submittedly given up. However this may be, they sulked off; but to say that they, expressly or by inference, objected to St. Augustine in his deputed capacity is a gratuitous venture. Not one of them denied the Pope's authority. As far as can be known, the subject was not mooted. But Augustine's mission, which opened with such fair promises, and

really brought into the Church vast multitudes, owing to interecne strife, became contracted in its limits. About this time missionaries from Ireland entered the north of England, to propagate the Gospel. And this was Rome working through Ireland. In 664 King Oswi convoked a council at Whitby, at which Colman and Wilfrith, the leaders of the British and the Roman parties, respectively, fully discussed their ecclesiastical differences. Greene says (p. 64): "The points actually contested were trivial enough. Colman, Aidan's successor at Holy Isle, pleaded for the Irish fashion of the tonsure, and for the Irish time of keeping Easter; Wilfrith pleaded for the Roman. The one disputant appealed to the authority of Columba, the other to that of St. Peter." "You own," cried the puzzled king at last to Colman, "that Christ gave to Peter the keys of the kingdom of heaven; has He given such power to Columba?" "The Bishop could but answer, 'No.' "Then will I rather obey the pastor of heaven," said Oswi, "lest when I reach thy gates he who has the keys in his keeping turn his back on me, and there be none to open." The importance of Oswi's judgment was never doubted at Lindisfarne, where Colman, followed by the whole of the Irish brethren, and thirty of their English fellows forsook the See of St. Aidan, and sailed away to Iona." Read the rest to, "It was from such a chaos as this that England was saved by the victory of Rome in the Synod of Whitby." By 669, when Pope Vitalian sent Theodore into England, the succession from Augustine had vanished. The "Apostolic succession" of the Anglican Church, if demonstrable at all, must pass back through Theodore. Anglicans can never touch the British Church by "succession." Read this: "Those who drew these letters patent seem not to have been aware that the orders in the Church of Rome: if, therefore, the Church of Rome is an anti-Christian society, her authority is gone, and her privileges forfeited; by consequence, the next inference is, that the benefit of the priesthood and the force of holy administrations must be lost in the English Church" (Collier, vol. VII, p. 101). So far it is plain to me that the Anglican Church, both by its people as a nation and by the claim of order, is a stranger to the British Church; and if a descent could be made out, the work would prove that the present "Catholic" Church is recreant to her first love.

It was from Theodore's time to Henry VIII that according to the Homily against idolatry, "not only the unlearned and simple, but the learned and wise; not the people only, but the bishops; not the sheep, but also the shepherds themselves. . . . fell both into the pit of damnable idolatry. In the which all the world, as it were drowned, continued until our age, by the space of above eight hundred years. . . . So that laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages, sects, and degrees of men, women, and children, of whole christendom (pretty well distributed) have been at once drowned in abominable idolatry, of all other vices most detested of God, and most damnable to man, and that by the space of eight hundred years and more." This is plain, vigorous talk; but the whole thing betrays a sublime forgetfulness of the continuous British Church. Still what does it signify? Mr. Palmer tones it down to a mere nothing; he says as if there was anything obscure in it: "The meanings, that some persons in every class were guilty of idolatry, which is very certain; but not that the whole Church, literally speaking, fell into damnable idolatry, for if so, it must have entirely failed, which would be contrary to the belief of the Church of England." (Vol. I, p. 308) This, of course, is based on the fact that "all ages, sects, and degrees of men, women, and children," is equivalent to "some persons," just a very few. Mr. Palmer abounds in such clever explanations. The whole Church in England before the sixteenth century, whether addicted to idolatry or not, was above all things "Roman;" and she was not only believed in and trusted to by kings, statesmen, warriors, philosophers, and writers, whom all Englishmen might well honor for laying the foundations of England's greatness, framing her laws, opening her resources, filling the country with the grandest architectural monuments in the world, and raising to the highest pitch her military prowess among the nations; but she was revered by the whole nation. Signs of the nation's wish to free itself from "Romanism," nowhere crop out in history.

TO BE CONTINUED.

SPECIAL TO THE CATHOLIC RECORD. FROM HALIFAX, N. S.

The new church, of St. Agnes is paid for as far as the work has gone, but funds are needed to complete the inside. It has been proposed to have a party or picnic on the very nice grounds surrounding the Church, and a meeting for that purpose will be held on Tuesday evening.

St. Mary's C. Y. M. club are making rapid strides towards raising funds for the building of their new hall, which will cost at the lowest calculation \$15,000.

The celebrated Mr. Chinique is and has been in town for the past two weeks attending the Presbyterian assembly for paltry silver collections. He has been induced to scandalize the Catholic Church one night in Halifax and one in Truro.

The good Sisters of Charity have instituted under them in St. Mary's and St. Patrick's schools can enjoy the holiday (Saturday). Each child paying ten cents can have a very enjoyable day.

Last Saturday over two hundred children started from Robinson's stables at 9.30 (in charge of five Sisters) for the grounds of His Grace, the Archbishop and spent the day in all kinds of sport, returning at 5.30 p. m.

Father Underwood is in hopes to commence the new church in Dartmouth this summer, and his people are working hard with that end in view.

His Grace the Archbishop has seen fit to have a special mass, for children only, every Sunday at 10.15. This is a grand idea and one much needed.

DESTROY THE WORMS or they may destroy the children. Freeman's Worm Powders destroy and expel all kinds of worms.

CARDINAL MANNING.

INCLINED PLANE OF UNBELIEF. London Universe, June 9.

The Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster preached on Sunday morning at the last Mass at SS. Peter and Edward's Westminster. His Eminence took his text from the first chapter of the Book of the Prophet Malachi: "From the rising of the sun to the going down, My name is great among the Gentiles. And in every place there shall be sacrifice; and there shall be offered in My name a clean oblation." His Eminence said: The other day we adored the Ever Blessed Trinity and the Eternal Son of God at the right hand of His Father. He is therefore present in the glory of the Ever Blessed Trinity; nevertheless, He is here in the midst of us. How can these things be? Let us consider for a little while. The Holy Council of Trent uses these words, "Jesus having loved His own while He was in the world, loved them to the end, and that He might never be absent from His own, of His own wisdom, He ordained a way of presence which the intellect of man cannot comprehend but which the heart of man, illuminated by faith, can conceive." The Most Holy Sacrifice is, first of all, a commemoration. It is, next, a representation. And, thirdly, it is a reality. You remember that our Lord, on that last night before He was betrayed, when His soul was sorrowful even unto death, and when His Disciples were sorrowful because they knew He was going away, took bread, and broke it, and blessed it, and said, "Take ye this; it is My Body." "Do this in commemoration of Me." He then instituted an action which should continue to the end of the world. And the worship of the Catholic Church therefore consists not in words—though it is enveloped in words—but it consists in an action. "Do this." He did not say, "Say this." And the action which He instituted and commanded to be perpetual is the Holy Mass. And therefore.

THE DIFFERENCE OF CATHOLIC WORSHIP from all other forms of worship is this: it consists in an action—the consecration and the oblation. It matters not in what language or tongue the prayers at the altar may be uttered; the faithful know, and the little child knows, that it is the action of the consecration and the oblation of the precious Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. And yet, as I have said, this action is enveloped—clothed in words. Take your Missal and follow me. The words of the Mass are not mere human words. First of all, the Gloria in Excelsis—"Gloria be to God in the highest"—was sung by the heavenly host on the night of the Nativity. Next, the Apostles' Creed—whence did it come? Not from any man, not from a human intelligence; it came from the lips of the Son of God Himself and from God the Holy Ghost the Spirit of Truth, who, on the Day of Pentecost, came by His illumination to interpret all that the Son of God had taught, and to fill up and complete the whole mystery and knowledge of the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation, and the Holy Sacraments. Therefore the Creed is a Divine composition. Thirdly the Sanctus sanctus, sanctus—"Holy, holy, holy"—was learned from the Seraphim; the Prophet Isaiah heard these words sung by the heavenly host, and wrote them for our instruction. Once more, the words of consecration are the words of our Divine Lord Himself. In the consecration of His Body and His Blood we commemorate the very action which He did the night before He was betrayed. Then comes the Lord's Prayer which He Himself has taught us. And there the Holy Mass is a Divine action, clothed in Divine words—for the other parts of the Missal, which vary with the day and with the festival, are drawn from the Holy Scripture, from the inspired Book. This, then, is the first aspect of the Holy Mass—a Divine action in words inspired by the Holy Ghost. Secondly, it is a representation. St. Paul says, "As often as ye eat this Bread and drink this Chalice, ye shall set forth the Lord's death until He comes." And therefore what is represented there? It represents the Incarnation, for the bread and wine represent the Body and the Blood assumed by the Son of God. Secondly, it represents His Passion and Death—because the separation of the Body and the Blood is represented by a separate consecration visible to the eye—though they are inseparable now, for

DEATH HATH NO MORE DOMINION over Him. Nevertheless, when He died His Body and Blood were parted asunder, and the separate consecration of the two elements is a representation of the separation of the Body and Blood of our Divine Master on the cross. But though the Sacrifice is represented to our eyes by a separate consecration, the Body and Blood of our Divine Lord in glory will never be parted; and for this reason, though the two elements are necessary for the Sacrifice, they are not necessary for Communion. They that partake of the Body partake of the Blood; and they that partake of the Blood partake of the Body; and therefore only the priest who consecrates consumes both; as at the Last Supper only the Apostles received both from the hands of their Divine Master; so all the faithful—and even a priest, if he be present—receives only one kind. It is an act of faith—a profession of faith, and it contains a doctrine. And you may be sure of this; whenever anybody contends about Communion under one kind, that person does not believe in the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. Lastly, it is an oblation. Our Lord's offering of Himself at the Last Supper was an act which was inchoate; it was begun at that moment, continued through that night, and with patient and inconceivable suffering finished and completed upon the cross. It was one solemn act from its outset to its end, and what His priests do at the altar is to commemorate and represent with the most precise minuteness that action which He did the last night before He suffered. So far all Christians profess to believe alike—though I am afraid I must limit that, because my last words describe only what Catholics believe, and

THOSE WHO IMITATE THE CATHOLIC CHURCH,

and who, not being in it or of it, nevertheless have happily received some light of truth, and begun to approach it. Now we come to the third point, and there it is that the Catholic Church stands alone—save only the great Greek schism in the East, which having committed separation from the unity of the Church, has forfeited some truths, but it has not forfeited the Ever Blessed Trinity, or the Incarnation, or the Real Presence, or the Blessed Sacrament. But, apart from this, if we look at the Christian world outside the unity of the Catholic Church, what do we see? We see that it has the commemoration; that it has the presentation in part, but not in whole; but the reality—no! And it is to testify, and

that the Feast of Corpus Christi was instituted; and the whole octave will be spent in bearing witness not only to the intellect and the heart, but to the eye and the sense, of the reality to the reality of our Lord's Presence. There are three ways in which the Divine Presence is with us. First, there is the beginning when God created all things. He is present in all things—or rather all things are in, and compassed by, Him. It is His essence which keeps them in existence; His presiding Presence which orders them all, and His power which governs them all. But God was invisible until He became Man. When the Son of God came into the world, there was not only the invisible Divine Presence, but a Divine Presence visible in our manhood. Then there was a Presence which was divine and human. After He rose from the dead, for forty days He was teaching His Apostles to believe in this divine and human Presence. He walked with them, and they did not know Him. He broke bread and blessed it, and their eyes were opened; and He vanished out of their sight. He was no longer subject to the laws of nature, even as Man; and He was teaching them to believe in His Presence in the Most Holy Sacrament, which is real, personal, substantial Presence, invisible, veiled in the Sacred Host. And, now, is it possible that words could be plainer than those on which our faith in the Real Presence is grounded? "This is My Body; this is My Blood." "Unless ye eat of the Flesh of the Son of Man and drink His Blood ye have no life in you." "He that eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day." "My flesh is meat indeed, and My Blood is drink indeed." "As the living Father hath sent Me, and I live by the Father"—that is, consubstantially—so he that eateth Me, even he shall live by Me." Is not that consubstantially? How are we children of the first Adam? Is it not because the substance of the first man was multiplied in all mankind?

HOW IS IT THAT FROM THE APPLE TREE we gather the apple fruit? The apple tree was created in the beginning, but that identical tree is not visibly present to-day; but the substance of the apple tree is in every apple tree that bears fruit at this hour. And therefore the substance of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ is in the Most Holy Sacrament, and in the Most Holy Sacrament is given to us. As the Holy Council of Trent teaches, He is at the right hand of His Father according to the natural mode of His existence, but in the Most Holy Sacrament He is present in a supernatural and Divine mode of existence—in a manner that cannot be judged by sense, nor measured, nor weighed, nor tested by chemistry, but as a Divine reality—absolutely. Well, there was two kinds of theology. There is the theology of man and the theology of God. The theology of man is

A NEGATIVE THEOLOGY. It began in the beginning. When St. Paul preached the Resurrection there were men who said, "No, but the resurrection is passed; it is spiritual; it is over and gone." Afterwards there were those who said, "Oh yes, Jesus Christ was God, no doubt, but He had only the appearance of a man; He was not really man." After them came those who said, "Oh yes, He was a man, but He was not God." Then following on them came those who said, "Yes, we admit the bread and wine are a commemoration and a representation; but they are not a reality." What is the consequence of this theology of man and of negation? That those who begin with the negation of a doctrine here and there have come to say that there is no God, or, at least, that if there is we cannot know Him. Then they go on to deny that they have no freedom of will—which is

THEIR WAY OF EXCUSING THEIR SINS. They go on, next, to question the existence of right and wrong. "Right and wrong," they say, "what are they? I learned from my parents what they learned from theirs; it is all custom, all convention; there is no law; our own will is our law; and there is no Law-giver." To such a state of debasement and impotence, intellectual and moral, this negation of the doctrines of faith have reduced men over a large part of the modern world. Is it not, then, true that the Presence of our Divine Lord in the Blessed Sacrament is the very centre and bond which sustains throughout the whole unity of the Catholic Church, within which the Ever Blessed Trinity is glorified, the Incarnation is professed, the Holy Sacraments are believed in, the Divine law is taught to the little ones of the flock, and, according to the measure of their infirmity, is fulfilled by the faithful. That brings me to a thought which has often been in my mind. Three hundred years ago in every church, in every chapel

IN THE WHOLE OF LONDON, there was the Presence of Jesus in the Most Holy Sacrament on the altar. There was the lamp hanging in the sanctuary in testimony of perpetual adoration. In those days the people of England, in the full light of their faith, adored our Divine Master. In those days the little child grew up in the very presence of His Divine Master, and there learned to know Him from the first opening, from the first movement, of his reason. That was a time when indeed the words of St. John were fulfilled, "And the Word was made flesh and dwelt amongst us; and we saw His glory, the glory of the Only Begotten of the Father full of grace and truth." How is it now? In one day the Blessed Sacrament was removed from every altar in every church and every chapel; that is, a perpetual God Friday was proclaimed, and in all sanctuaries which had been full of the light of the Presence of "the Word made flesh" there reigned the coldness and the emptiness of the tomb where Jesus

was laid. And this brings me to my last word. I am bid to ask your alms day for the schools where your little children here are taught. I can bear witness that they are faithfully taught, for the Inspectors both of the Government and of the diocese have declared these schools to be good. I know with what fidelity, too, the teachers who have the care of these little children have fulfilled their duty; and I can testify to the watchfulness with which the pastors who have the care of both the teachers and the taught discharge also their obligations. I do not think I need say much on this subject. I will only remind you that the soul of a little child is the nearest to Himself. In the soul of every little child which you pass in the street there is the power of its being developed and unfolded—or, as we say, educated—into the image and likeness of our Divine Lord when He was a little child, or of being deformed and destroyed, and made like to the image of Lucifer in his pride and in his fall. How is it possible, then, to be indifferent? Now, there are at present

TWO KINDS OF SCHOOLS IN THIS LAND. There was one only until some eighteen years ago, and these schools were Christian schools, in which children were trained up to know the Ever Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation, and, in Catholic schools, all the doctrines of the faith. But now there is another class of schools in which the Bible is read, but not interpreted, except chronologically and ethnologically, but not doctrinally nor in the sense of the Christian faith. And therefore there are two classes of children growing up in two classes of schools—Christian schools and schools without Christianity. The people that were once one—in Christianity, at least, if not in the whole inheritance of the faith—are now being divided; the little ones of the land are growing up in division. And

WHAT IS THE EFFECT OF THIS? That our little children mingle continually with companions who have never been taught to know God and His Blessed Mother; never been taught to know the Blessed Sacrament. They are with them continually, all day long perhaps except when in school, and these companions are undoing the work of the schools, say, not only undoing the work of faith, but also of morals, for the Ten Commandments are not taught in these schools. I wish I could stop here, but I am sorry I cannot. The best school is a good home;

THE WORST SCHOOL IS A BAD HOME, and the greatest enemies these poor children often have are their own fathers and mothers. What chance then, I will ask, have these poor little ones of learning to know God and His law except in schools? Therefore, lay this to heart; remember the words of our Divine Lord, "Take heed how ye despise one of these little ones"—that is, how ye neglect, take no heed of, pass carelessly by. Do not say "What have I to do with this; it is a matter for priests, and schoolmasters, and schoolmistresses." You have this to do with it; you will have to answer for it, for their angels do always behold the face of their Father who is in heaven.

MORE LIGHT.

That the Church has nothing to fear from investigation and the fullest discussion has been proved a great many times, but, perhaps, never more strikingly than by the outcome of the recent agitation in England over the proposed naval battle which resulted in the destruction of the Spanish Armada. The interest awakened in the public has led to a close investigation of all the documents and records bearing upon the question, and the result is the complete demolishing of an old fable long accepted as history. The popular and long established version of the story has been that the great battle was one between Catholicism and Protestantism; that the Spanish emperor wanted to compel all Englishmen to become "Papists;" that he had ready thumb-screws, boots and pulleys with which to torture them into apostasy. But Professor Laughton, of King's College, London, has made a close examination of the records, and declares now that there was, in fact, very little of religious motive in the undertaking. England had long been engaged in piratical hostilities against Spain, and an additional reason for resentment was supplied by England assisting the Netherlands in their revolt against Philip. So papers like our Boston Transcript, which really insisted upon the celebration of the anniversary as a great anti-Catholic festival, must be disappointed. There is no ground for such a demonstration in the historical facts of the case, nor is there apparently any general disposition in England to give it such a character.

Another recent instance of the benefit which comes from fair and open discussion is furnished by the "indulgence" episode in Boston. Rev. Father Metcalf, of South Boston, protested publicly against the misrepresentations of a teacher in the public schools who taught that Catholic indulgences were licences to commit sin. The teacher, in defence, fell back upon the text-books of history in use in public schools. A discussion in the newspapers followed and the result has been a complete refutation of the teacher and his text-books. The Boston Advertiser, with unusual and even singular fairness and liberality, has published a series of articles setting forth the Catholic doctrine upon the subject. Other papers have followed suit, and thousands of people can now no longer hold the old-fashioned and vulgar Protestant errors about indulgences without admitting their own determination to be bigoted and prejudiced in spite of all evidence against them.—Catholic Review.

The Life Current.

Deprive the vegetable world of moisture and it pines, withers and dies; the whole earth becomes parched, and desolation pervades the landscape. Deprive the human system of pure blood and health is impossible, disease inevitable. The skin becomes charged with repulsive humors, the lungs loaded with foreign secretions, fevers ensue, and, unless speedily arrested, death follows. Renew to healthy action the liver, the great blood purifying gland, with Dr. Pierce's Golden Medical Discovery, and health flows through every avenue, restoring every organ to vigor. All druggists.

NATIONAL PILLS are sugar-coated, mild but thorough, and are the best Stomach and Liver Pills in use.