SAVAGE AND HIS CRITIC.

The Rev. Minot J. Savage is a Unitarian minister in New York. He is somewhat known as an author, having published several books. A recent outgiving of his has met with a good deal of criticism, and he replies to one of his critics—Mr. J. F. Woodlock—in a recent issue of the New York Sun. In this reply he makes some statements, against which he challenges scholarly contradiction.

The wording of this challenge is somewhat embarrassing, for, while he has not shrunk from implying his own sufficient scholarship to make the statements, he should not require the same amount of pretension on the part of those who cannot accept them. But, disregarding this embarrassment, we venture to contradict not only the two statements he refers to, but several others as well. That the reader may the better understand the subject we may state that Rev. Mr. Savage's letter is against the doctrine of the Trinity and the divinity of Christ, which is a part of that doctrine.

Savage—Where did Jesus ever say anything about any Trinity, or any persons in any Trinity, or Himself, as in any way related to such Trinity?

Comment—The question is not about words, but about a truth, a reality for which the term "Trinity" has been used for a years as a symbol. The term stands for "one God in three divine persons." It is this truth we must seek in the Scriptures and in the writings of the Fathers of the Church, whether expressed by one word or many. It is the same with the word "person." Anti-Trinitarians object that it is not found in the Scriptures, but that does not and ought not prevent them from believing that the God they believe in is a Person, nor does it require them to believe that there were no persons in existence until the word "person" was invented. A person is a subsistent, individual intelligence, and the Trinity means that there are three such subsistent intelligences having but one and the same divine nature. It is evidence of these that you should have asked for, and not for technical terms.

Savage—It there is to be any intelligent discussion of the question as to whether or not Jesus in God, at least two points must be clearly settled. First, it must be shown that the New Testament (or, at least, some one or more of its writers) teaches that Jesus is God. This involves the scholarly interpretation of the texts. Second, it must be clearly shown that these New Testament writers speak on the subject with adequate authority.

Comment—Your first point is a scholarly position, because it limits the evidence to a written record, which it self informs us that all the teachings of Christ and His Apostles are not to be found in that record, and some of the records no longer exist. Had the early Christians believed only what they found written in the New Testament they could have believed little or nothing of Christian truth, for the New Testament, as we have it, never had an existence for them. It was generations after their time before it was known what books constituted the New Testament. Your theory of limiting the evidence of Christian doctrine to the written record would have made it impossible for those living in the post Apostolic age to know what Christ and His Apostles taught or to prove anything by this authority, for they had not the record. As those early Christians knew and believed the teaching, and discipline of Christ without the written record of them, it follows that the record is not, as it was not to them, the sole means of coming to a knowledge of Chistian truth and law. Those early Christians acquired their knowledge through tradition and the teaching of the Church which Christ established to teach, and required His followers to hear. They did not learn of the existence of the Church from the Scriptures; on the contrary, they learned of the existence of the Scriptures from the authority of the Church, whose existence to them was as patent a fact as the existence of this Republic is to us.

In view of these facts it will be seen that Rev. Mr. Savages's limiting the investigation he proposes to the written record is as unscholarly as it would be to seek the interpretation and application of the Constitution in the histories of the United States, instead of seeking them in the decisions of the Supreme Court.

Our purpose in objecting to his first condition for an intelligent discussion of the doctrine of the Trinity was not to object to the Scripture test, but simply to take the Unitarian minister to task for proposing an unscholarly condition of discussion. We might, with equal propriety, object to his remark that the texts involved require a scholarly interpretation. A scholarly interpretation is well enough in its way, but an authoritative interpretation is what is required. There is but one agency on earth that can give that. This agency is the Church established by Christ to teach and interpret His words — an agency that existed and was in full operation before a word of the New Testament was written. Christ required obedience to this, His Church, under penalty of being considered as heathens and publicans. Her authority, then rests on His authority, and she is, therefore, the only competent court of appeals on earth in all matters concerning her Founder's revelation and law.

If the constitution of the United States were left to scholarly interpretations alone there would be the same confusion and conflict of scholarly interpretations in the political order that there are in the Protestant world today; all wrangle, endless dispute and nothing ultimate. What is needed is an authoritative interpretation, such as the Supreme Court, and that alone, can give. Appeal to scholarly interpretation—that is, to private judgment—is to appeal to a court that can never utter an ultimate and authoritative decision, that can never say its last word on any subject. Every man who enters seriously into a disputation assumes that he has the necessary scholarship and takes the fact that his opponent differs from him as evidence of lack of scholarship in that opponent. This is precisely what Rev. Mr. Savage does in reference to the opponent whom he criticizes. Perhaps he ought not to be blamed for this; it is so natural, and so very human.

He may say that thorough scholarly interpretation is defective and inconclusive. We must of necessity appeal to it in the absence of so nething better. But we deny the absence of something better. We affirm the presence in the world of that teacher and interpreter which Christ established and commissioned, His Church. That Church exists now or the gates of hell have prevailed against it. Its Founder said, "On this rock I will build my Church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it."

Rev. Mr. Savage is then reduced to the alternative of admitting the present existence of that Church or affirming that Christ was a false prophet.

Rev. Mr. Savage's second condition for an intelligent discussion of the question is, "that it must be clearly shown that the new Testament writers speak on the subject with adequate authority."

This is inconsistent with his first condition. He first appeals to the scriptures as conclusive authority, and in the second condition he requires some authority back of them to prove that they are authoritative. Why does he appeal to the Scriptures at all if he does not consider them ultimately authoritative? Why appeal to them with the caveat that if they do not coincide with his opinions he is free to reject them unless their "adequate authority" is proved. Is this not trifling in a very unscholarly manner with an opponent. Does he imagine that anyone can take his appeal to the Scriptures seriously under such condition? He demands a witness to be called with the understanding that if he favors your contention you must then call another witness to prove the "adequate authority" of the first witness. This third witness must have a fourth to certify him, and so on indefinitely. Is that what he would call a scholarly proceeding? In a court of justice it would be called the climax of puerility.

We now come to Rev. Mr. Savage's two statements against which he defies "scholarly contradiction."

Savage.—"In the first place, Jesus nowhere claims to be God, and no person in the New Testament whose name is known, makes any such claim on His behalf."

We confess that we have not the same complacent confidence in our scholarship that you evidently have in yours: but we venture, nevertheless, to contradict your statement, and we will give the reason why. St. John begins his gospel thus: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God, and all things were made by Him; and without Him was made nothing that was made. In Him was life, and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness and the darkness did not comprehend it. * * * And the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us (and we saw His glory, the glory as it were of the only begotten of the Father) full of grace and truth."

Now for you who challenge to the Scripture test these words of the evangelist St. John—the beloved disciple—should be adequate authority. Whether St. John's contradiction of you is "scholarly" we need not say. It is at least sublime. The remainder of St. John's gospel is a record of the acts and words of this "Word made flesh," and Who "dwelt among us"—Jesus Christ. In chapter x. St. John reports these words of Christ, "The Father is in me, and I in the Father. * * * I and the Father are one." Here His divine nature is clearly asserted. His Jewish hearers understood Him, but not believing His declarations, accused him of blasphemy and stoned Him.

It is needless to accumulate texts that might be quoted to prove that Christ is God. We will make but one more quotation. It is from the Apocalypse of St. John, where he describes Christ's second coming. "Jesus Christ, Who is the faithful witness, the first begotten of the dead and the prince of the kings of the earth, and Who hath loved us and washed us from our sins in His own blood. And hath made a kingdom and priests to God and his Father; to Him be glory and empire for ever and ever. Amen. Behold He cometh in the clouds and every eye shall see Him and they also that pierced Him. And all the tribes of the earth shall bewail themselves because of Him. Even so, Amen. I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, saith the Lord God of hosts, Who is and Who was and Who is to come, the Almighty." (Chapter 1, 5 to 9.) In these last words St. John refers to the prophet Isais, 44-6: "Thus saith the Lord the King of Israel and his Redeemer the Lord of hosts: I am the first and I am the last, and besides me there is no God."

Those who desire to see the full Scripture demonstration should read the treatises of Cardinal Gonsset, Perrone and Kenrick on the Trinity and divinity of Christ. They will be found sufficiently scholarly to gratify the most exacting.

Savage.—"Will he tell me of one Church father of the first two centuries and a half who either taught that Jesus was God or showed that it was the belief of any considerable portion of the Church?"

We will tell you first of St. Ignatius, a disciple of St. John the Evangelist and Bishop of Antioch from the year 70 to 107. This Christian Bishop in his letter to the Ephesians writes: "Our God Jesus Christ in uttero gestatus est a Maria." In his letter to the Romans he writes: "Ignatius, who is also Theophorus, to the Church which has found mercy on the majesty of the Father Most High and of Jesus Christ, His only Son (to the Church) beloved and enlightened in the will of Him Who willeth all things which are according to the love of Jesus Christ our God." In his letter to the Magnesians he wrote: "Be not led astray by strange doctrines, nor by antiquated tales, which are unprofitable. For if we yet live according to Judaism, it is equivalent to declaring that we have not accepted grace; for the most holy prophets lived according to Jesus Christ. And for that cause they were persecuted, being inspired by the grace of Christ, that the unbelieving might be convinced that there is one God Who hath manifested Himself by his Son Jesus Christ, Who is His eternal Word."

We might quote four to the same purpose, Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Athenagoras, Tertullian and others. But we will conclude this point by quoting, from St. Cyprian, who lived within the time specified by Rev. Mr. Savage. Arguing against heretical baptisms he asks how the subject of such baptism can become the temple of God? And says: "If he be thereby made the temple of God, I would ask of what divine person is it? is it God the Creator? He could not be so if he believed not in him. Is it of Christ? Neither can he be his temple if he denies Christ to be God. Is it then of the Holy Spirit? But since the three are one, how can the Holy Spirit have friendship with him that is at enmity with either the Father or Son?"

St. Augustine, the celebrated Bishop of Hippo (395), thus speaks of the writers before and of his time: "All the Catholic authors, ancient and modern, that I have been able to read, and who before me have written on the Trinity, which is God, have intended to teach according to the Scriptures, that the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, of one substance form the divine unity by their inseparable equality, and that on that account there are not three Gods, but one only God; though the Father Who begot the Son, is other than the Son, and the Son, begotten of the Father, is other than the Father, and the Holy Ghost is neither the Father nor the Son, but only the Spirit of the Father and the Son, being Himself coequal with the Father and the Son, and belonging to the unity of the Trinity. This is my faith, because it is the Catholic faith."

Augustine had access to many writings that are now no longer extant, and he knew, from those that are extant and from these that have perished, what the, to him even, ancient writers meant to teach. He cannot be rejected for lack of scholarship.

There are a few points left in Rev. Mr. Savage's letter that we will consider next week.—New York Freeman's Journal.

Those Bogus Prayers.

Writing of the unauthorized "prayers" which designing or misguided people put in circulation among certain classes of our Catholic people, the Church Progress truly says; "Of course, it is always the good pious people who are imposed upon by their circulation. They never give any concern to those on whom religion rests lightly. But good, pious people should shun them. Not infrequently are such alleged powerful prayers the work of some designing bigot. They are put forth with the express purpose of deceiving. It is the bigot's method of testing the credulity of the devout and unsuspecting Catholic. They possess no more virtue than the paper on which they appear. As a final word, however, on the subject, we would say to all who seek authentic Catholic prayers that they should stick to the prayer book. In these they will find those which have received the approval of the Church. If they desire to follow a particular devotion, the prayers proper for it they will find in some approved manual. Here there can be no mistake, for all such books bear upon their initiaal pages the approbation that makes them authentic. Acept none without it and use only such as have it, and no mistake will be made."

AN IMPORTANT PROBLEM "OUR LEAKAGE AND HOW TO STOP IT."

BY DR. JOS. SELINGER OF ST. FRANCIS SEMINARY.

So many men fail the Church, is a complaint often heard. There is no general exodus, but a defection which, because it is gradual, does not excite immediate attention. The manner of it is cause of increased anxiety. Those having care of souls deplore what too often happens in their experience. Here, for instance, is a Catholic family with half a dozen or more boys. They were educated in Catholic schools; yet, fairly launched in commercial and professional enterprises, one by one lessens in fervor in the practice of his faith, and finally omits it entirely. There is another family in which the boys enjoyed equal advantages, but not one of them took a Catholic wife. Failures of boys of other families less favored, who soon after their first Holy Communion must earn their bread in shops and factories, need not be mentioned. Those mentioned are for the parposes of precluding the application of these causes of failure to all cases. Even with Catholic school and home advantages, boys too often quit the Church after reaching manhood.

The decline of the practice of the faith, particularly in populous parishes, is hardly noticed by the congregation. It is known that many have been Catholics, but not why they are Catholics no longer. Often the decline is sudden, especially so when the young man is away from home, a stranger to his surroundings. Sometimes languages and customs differing from those of his boyhood parish, deter him from entering heartily. Parents grieve, because the boy fails in practice of faith when he is emancipated from parental authority. Age and quality, as he rises in the ladder, seem to prosper diminution of faith. Professional careers and city-life appear to draw men from the Church with peculiar instance.

Why it is so may not be easy to say. Some think the fault is found in personal circumstance only. Some demand statistics, before they accept what others see. Some, shutting their eyes, protest: "More men attend Catholic services on Sundays than men, women, and children of all other denominations together." They do not avert that, though the comparison stands, the fact still remains. Some again wrap themselves in exclusiveness and answer. "The case is not so with us!" They defy proof claimed to be with, in their sight. Finally, some, pretending a broader view, declare, "No nation is as Christian as is our nation"—which is like seeing the mote in your brother's eye.

A large number interested in the matter admit the condition, but avow, "There is no cure." We have come upon times of unbelief, in their opinion. The air is rife with aversion to Church rule. Many gospel maxims indeed are admired and in part observed, but religion, in modern thinking a personal concern, in no concrete form is considered to oblige all under pain of loss.

It is permissible to ask further: "Is there no reason within, which might be added to the number? Are we doing all that could and should be done for our men and boys?" A whole army of unselfish workers confronts the questioner at this juncture. With due regard for their labors the question is still in order. Are we employing all possible means to further the kingdom of Christ among men. Let no one rejoin, "The Church knows her duty!" She certainly does, and can never utterly fail in it. Her example and history teach how to behave under trying circumstances.

The lesson is too often forgotten that man is the minister as well as the recipient of divine faith. Preaching the Word does not here apply exclusively to the priest in stole and surplice; every Catholic is an exponent of it by "conversation worthy of the gospel." (Phil. i, 27.)

The intellectual and moral temper of our time should be studied and appreciated. What is good should be pressed into service. Sympathy is necessary. Social conditions, however much deplored, are here to stay. Has it come to this that men must be told to retire from the world, if they will remain faithful to the Church? There is contention indeed (Ephes. vi. 11 ss.) but St. Paul taught the early Christians how to brave it. Our Catholic laborer and man of wealth, our Catholic in business and in the professions, in society and politics, are to be assisted in their honest endeavors. * * How soon, alas! the masterly expositions of our Holy Father are forgotten. * *

Christian principles and directions for modern enterprises, with special reference to men, are given in the Pontifical encyclicals. Education and the press are indispensable in the undertaking. They must, however, be handled with direct purpose. We must go down into the workshop. We must sympathize with the rising generation. It has difficulties, all too real, of its own. Our young men must be convinced that the authority of the Church, exercised in its sphere by divine appointment, is not an enemy, but a friend of true progress. They should be told that the Church relies on their honor and integrity for the commendation and application of the only certain solution of the complicated problems of modern life; they should be "without reproof in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation," (Phil. ii, 15.) "having faith and good conscience, which some rejecting have made shipwreck concerning the faith." (Tim. i, 19.)—The Review, St. Louis.

THE PURITAN MYTH.

The descendants of the Puritans are nothing if not modest. They would have us believe that if it had not been for their progenitors the American continent would still be a sort of a barren waste. This idea they have done their best to popularize. A sample of the way in which this is done is furnished by a speech delivered by Senator Depew on December 22, which has been dubbed "Forefathers' Day."

We do not know whether Depew lays claim to Puritan descent. But whether he does or not makes no difference. He is just the sort of a person to accept the Puritan myth, for no other reason than that by dint of reiteration it passes current as the truth. In the speech to which we have referred Chauncey Depew imagines that Miles Standish returns to life, and here is what he sees according to the veracious Chauncey:

"He finds that the 101 people who landed on Plymouth Rock only 282 years ago have become a nation of eighty millions of people; that their wealth has increased from the Mayflower's total of £2,400, or $11,600, to a thousand billion of dollars; that the Plymouth boundaries extending a few miles into the then unknown wilderness, new reach from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and from the Gulf of Mexico to the Artic circle, and that the whole of this vast domain is filled with great cities, thriving villages, prosperous farms, manufacturing centers, and a self-governing people, the most intelligent, the most prosperous, happy and wealthy of any nation in the world."

The assertion that "The 101 people who landed on Plymouth Rock 282 years ago have become a nation of eighty millions of people" should have staggered even an audience made up exclusively of descendants of the Puritans.

It would be safe to bet that not one of those who listened to Depew's astounding statement gave a thought to the Catholic Frenchmen who had penetrated to the Far West and had even explored the New England coast long before a Puritan set foot on Massachusetts soil. These pioneers of civilization on the American continent were neither "Anglo-Saxons," nor Protestants, and therefore their work counts for nothing. We must give credit only to the Puritans, who had scarcely landed when they proceeded to civilize the natives off the face of the earth.

The assumption that the Puritans were the first plant the seeds of civilization in what is now the United States is on a par with the other assumption that the descendants of these Puritans were the only persons who contributed to the work the results of which Depew describes in his own peculiar way.

If we are to believe Depew we are indebted to the Puritans not only for material prosperity, but for the principles of constitutional liberty which were proclaimed and defended by Catholics long before Protestantism found foothold in England. Catholic pioneers in the cause of constitutional liberty are, however, not to have any credit, as all credit must be reserved for the much-be-praised and much-over-rated Puritans who, if we are to believe their eulogists, were the greatest benefactors of the human race the world ever saw. It is not time that all this nonsense about the Puritans should cease?—New York Freeman's Journal.

CATHOLICITY'S PHENOMENAL ADVANCE.

A FAMOUS PROTESTANT SCHOLAR ON THE CHURCH'S ADVANCE IN RECENT TIMES.

From the Literary Digest we reprint the following translation of a remarkable statement of the growth and growing power of the Church contributed to the Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift, of Leipzig, Germany, by the famous Church historian, Rev. Dr. Kolde, of Erlangen, one of the leading Protestant scholars of that country.

Few people, and only those who study modern facts in the light Church history, have any appreciation of the phenomenal advance made by the Catholic Church during the last decades, especially as a power in the political world and in the conquests of new spheres of thought and life. It is by no means a pleasant thing for Protestants to contemplate; but it is an undeniable fact that not since the days of Innocent III. has the Papal system unfolded such splendor and power as in the present time. Not the Catholic rulers, but rather the Protestant rulers are the ones who are trying to surpass each other in honoring the shrewd sage now occupying the throne in the Vatican, although it is this same sage who has repeatedly called the Reformation a "pest."

In other respects, the Church has grown phenomenally. Each year the number of those who swell the ranks of the religious orders grows by the thousands, and in the German Empire alone there are now 40,000 of these. Not since the days of the Reformation have these orders, especially the Jesuits, developed the strength they evince in our days. The Catholics control the Parliaments and they make our laws, and in countries like Germany, where State and Church are united, they even pass the laws regulating the affairs of the Protestant church. With every day the principle is gaining more and more ground that it is not ability and efficiency, but the attitude toward the Catholic Church, that opens the way for candidates to positions in the State service. The statesmen of Europe are largely and in many cases mostly influenced in their internatianal politics by the views that may prevail in the Vatican; and what is more remarkable, that which the ambitious Innocent III. failed to attain, and that against which even Catholic princes and Bishops have constantly protested, namely, the assigning of the position of judge on international difficulties to the Pope—this has been first voluntarily yielded to the Vatican by the leading Protestant powers of Europe, Prussia, and Germany, the former of these also having been the first to recognize the Curia as a political power on equal footing with other powers by sending an ambassador to the Vatican.

In conclusion the famous German remarks: "Humanly speaking, the Catholic Church is destined to achieve still more notable conquests in the twentieth century."—Philadelphia Standard and Times.

TO COLORED NON-CATHOLICS.

FATHER SUTTON CONDUCTS THE FIRST MISSION OF THE KIND AT WILMINGTON.

Catholic Standard and Times.

After closing the grand mission for non-Catholics at the pro-Cathedral, Rev. Xavier Sutton went to St. Joseph's Church and on Monday night opened there a mission for non-Catholic colored people.

Bishop Monaghan was anxious to have something done for these people. Father Sutton said he had never done any work of this kind, but would be pleased to make a beginning. The course of lectures had been advertised among the colored population, the Josephite priests in charge, Rev. Fathers Glandy and Nally, having gone from house to house asking the people to come. The announcement was made that no white people would be admitted. There is a population of 17,000 colored people in Wilmington, and of that number about 150 are Catholic.

St. Joseph's church will seat about 400, and it was thought the building would be filled to overflowing; the weather, however, proved unfavorable. It rained and sleeted the first two evenings, so that very few—perhaps 75—were present, the Negroes as a rule disliking extremely to go out in wet or cold weather. This was a drawback to the mission; however, the remaining nights the audience was much better, about 200 being present.

Many people think that it is easy to persuade the Negro to become a Catholic—that all we have to do is to throw open the doors of the church and they will come in; this is a mistake. Just like his ignorant, prejudiced white brother, the Negro is filled with lies about the Catholic Church; he frequently has a fear and superstitious dread of even going into the Catholic church. Their preachers fail not to keep alive this sentiment; secret societies flourish among them and they are told that the Catholic Church is opposed to all such societies. One of these societies has rather a queer name, "The Seven White Sisters," and this one requires its members to promise that they will have nothing to do with Catholics.

There are a number of well-to-do and educated Negroes in Wilmington, but none of them came to the mission.

AN APPRECIATIVE AUDIENCE.

Those who came to the lectures seemed to be pleased. Sometimes during the lectures one of the audience would give expression to his feelings by saying out loud, "That is right!" One night Father Sutton was speaking of the barque of Peter, and he said: "I you want to get to heaven you must get into Peter's barque. Peter's boat is the one that carries passengers to heaven." "A—men, Alleluia!" shouted a voice from the middle of the church. Father Sutton found out afterwards that the ejaculator was an old colored sailor, a convert. No one seemed to be disturbed by these expressions of feeling and the lecturer seemed not to mind them either.

After the lecture Father Sutton went down among the crowd, and the Negroes were pleased to come up and shake hands with him and talk about the mission.

A number of questions were asked and answered every evening, most of them being like the usual queries and others somewhat amusing.

"Was John the Baptist the founder of the Baptist Church?"

"What do you think of people who when they have a love feast break bread together and eat bread with one another and don't speak to one another for years and throw the bread on the floor to keep from eating it? Is that Christianity?"

"Does a colored person have the same rights and privileges in the Catholic Church as a white person? Please tell me where does the priest get the power to forgive sin? Can you give me any Scriptures for it?"

"Please tell me, Do you think that you keep the 10 curments Do you blive that thair aneyboddy that dos not curmet sin is ther aney one on the erth good?"

"Dos Catholic really beleave that Eucharist is the real boddy and Blood of Christ the Bible dont say so it is only figurative in Rememburns of him."

"Is the Bible the only guide we have to go by and what one do the Catholics go by, the old or the New Testament?"

"What is Solemn High Mass for?"

"Does a priest take money to get souls out of Purgatory. If so, how much would he charge?"

"What makes a nun, and are they Catholic?"

"Why do you have nuns in the Catholic churches I don't see hem in other church. Are they better than any body?"

HARD TO WIN THE ADULTS.

They seemed glad to receive a copy of "Clearing the Way." Over two hundred were given out during the week. One night a Catholic was at a bazaar given by tha Baptist church and she saw a young colored preacher showing the book to the people, and she heard him saying: I would not take $50 for it."

It seems as though little progress can be made with the grown-up Negro. The Fathers in charge say the work must be done with the children. The Negro may admit that the Catholic is the true Church but he won't change. An old Negress said to one of the priests here: "I like to hear that preacher, Father Sutton, but he won't change me. I was bo'n Methodist and I'll surely die Methodist!"

The Negro doesn't look much to reason; he must be gained by affection. If you win his confidence, then you have a chance to bring him into the Church.

The colored preacher has a great influence among them, and if he hears of any going to the Catholic Church, he is after them. A woman had her sick child baptized by the priest, and as soon as the preacher heard of it he went to her and gave him a great scolding. "Praise the bridge that carries you over!" was the answer she made him.

Bishop Monaghan and some of the clergy were present at the lecture last night, when Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament was given, and the largest crowd of all was present.

No doubt much good has been done, although no converts were made. Some careless Catholics, however, were brought back to their duty, also a better feeling was established among these poor people. The Negro problem is a great one that faces the Catholic Church in the United States. How shall it be solved? How can these ten millions of people be brought into the Church?

M.

Ireland's Social Purity.

Writing of the vital statistics of Ireland for the year 1901, the Weekly Freeman, of Dublin, says they have a melancholy meaning, the natural increase of the population being more than swamped by the tide of emigration. On one point, however, the figures are reassuring. Says the Freeman: "The country still maintains its proud pre-eminence in the matter of social purity. Only 2.6 per cent. of the births were illigitimate; and in Connaught, where the people were poorest and marriages fewest, the percentage was only 0.7."

An English Protestant on The Mass.

Has the English Church as a Church since the Reformation continued to celebrate the Mass after the same fashion and with the same intention as she did before? If "Yes," to the ordinary British layman the quarrel with the Pope even the ban of the Pope and his foreign cardinals, will seem but one of those matters to which it is so easy to give the slip. Our quarrel with the Pope is of respectable antiquity France, too, had hers. But if "No," the same ordinary layman will be puzzled, and, if he has a leaning to sacraments and the sacramental theory of religion and nature, will grow distraught.

However much there may be that is repulsive to many minds in ecclesiastical millinery and matters * * * it is doubtful whether any poor sinful child of Adam (not being a paid agent of the Protestant Alliance) even witnessed, however ignorantly, and it may be with only the languid curiosity of a traveler, the Communion service according to the Roman Catholic ritual without emotion. It is the Mass that matters; it is the Mass that makes the difference, so hard to define, so subtle is it, yet so perceptible, between a Catholic country and a Protestant one, between Dublin and Edinburgh, between Havre and Cromer. —Augustine Birrell Essays and Addresses.